Pamphlet
Binder
Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/lettersofvaleru00combuoft

C 1254 kk

THE

LETTERS OF VALERIUS,

ON THE

STATE OF PARTIES,

THE WAR,

THE VOLUNTEER SYSTEM,

AND

MOST OF THE POLITICAL TOPICS

WHICH HAVE LATELY BEEN UNDER PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN "THE TIMES."

LONDON:

SOLD BY J. HATCHARD, PICCADILLY.

1804.

349434
14. 4. 38.

Printed by J. & J. Walter, Printing-House-Yard, Blackfriars.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE re-publication of fugitive Eſſays, which have appeared in the diurnal prints, though too frequently done to gratify the vanity of their authors, may yet, on ſome occaſions, be not unuſeful to the Public. Some very ſplendid productions have, in this form, firſt made their appearance; and, even where no merit is to be claimed from the compoſition, ſtill they may afford a faithful picture of the politics of the day; and, being written on the urgency of the occaſion, they ſometimes convey the ſentiments of the author in more lively colours than writings compoſed at a ſubſequent period, more at leiſure, and with deeper reflection.

The Letters now preſented to the Public may, perhaps, be found *not quite out of ſeaſon*, ſince they in part depict the ſpirit and character of *thoſe factions*, ſo long diſcordant, but who appear recently to have united upon the ſacrifice of *every political principle* and almoſt of every moral ſentiment, for the ſole purpoſe of *ſeizing*, by violence, upon the offices and emoluments of the State—for the profligate and flagitious purpoſe of *forcing* an *odious Adminiſtration* on one of the BEST OF SOVEREIGNS that ever adorned the Britiſh throne.

If any thing could render more deteſtable than common ſuch an attempt, it is *the circumſtances in which both the Monarch and the Nation are placed at this criſis*. Theſe cir-

circumſtances it is unneceſſary to repeat—they are impreſſed on the mind and feelings of every Engliſhman. The *People*, not leſs than the King, muſt feel the *diſgrace*, the *inſult* of being *bargained for* and transferred as a herd of cattle at a market or a fair, and they will doubtleſs reſiſt, as they have on former occaſions, every ſuch attempt. While the juſt prerogative of the Crown to nominate, without controul, its confidential ſervants, is ſtrictly regarded, let the principles of the Britiſh conſtitution be held in view in another reſpect—let us have *reſponſible miniſters*; and not a *ſelf-nominated* Venetian oligarchy, a *committee* of *public ſafety*, who at once duped the pretended Legiſlature of France, and uſurped its functions.

On the *characters* compoſing this *motley* faction, it may be neceſſary to enlarge in a future publication. In the mean time, few men of reflection will find them ſuch as are entitled to much reſpect. Of the preſent Miniſtry, it is enough to ſay, that while their *integrity* ſtands completely unimpeached, we have the moſt *ſubſtantial* proof of their talents, in the proud and commanding attitude which the nation, under their direction, is enabled to aſſume; and it is no mean commendation that, by a wiſe and judicious ſyſtem of conduct, ſeconded by the confidence and ſpirit of the country, they have hitherto rendered abortive the formidable deſigns of an enemy who has inſolently trampled on the reſt of Europe.

LONDON, 13*th of March*, 1804.

LETTER I.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

WHEN the deliberations of two great and reſpectable legiſlative Aſſemblies are, by the efforts of a faction, diverted from the public ſervice to the purpoſes of Party; when that purpoſe is evidently, and almoſt avowedly, to drive from their official ſituations men poſſeſſing the confidence of their Sovereign, and the affections of the People, that their opponents may enjoy, and, perhaps, abuſe, the power and the emoluments of the State; it then becomes the duty of the People to conſider well the conduct of their Miniſters and the claims of Oppoſition. And it is not only the duty, but the *intereſt* of the People, to inform themſelves fully on ſo important a ſubject; leſt, by joining too haſtily in an unfounded clamour, they ſanction a change which they may afterwards repent; forge for themſelves chains which it may be cumberſome to wear; and accumulate burthens which they may be unable to endure.

For the rude and illiberal attack which has been lately made upon Miniſters, ſome pains had been taken to prepare the public mind. We had been preſented with almoſt daily paragraphs in newſpapers, charging them, without evidence, without a ſingle fact in proof of the aſſertion, with incompetence and incapacity. Theſe paragraphs I read with indifference, as the productions of ſome obſcure and

illiterate scribblers. I remembered that such were the constant charges urged against Lord NORTH's and Mr. PITT's Administrations. They serve to fill a column, and they require no effort, either of *genius*, or of industry; for they are unsupported by proof, and are generally made, on all occasions, in the same words. Something, indeed, of a similar kind had been uttered by a Noble Lord, on their first accession to office; but as commendation is greatest when it proceeds from a person who is in himself commendable, so there are some persons whose censure is innocent. The words seemed to have been forgotten, almost before the sentence was concluded.

I cannot, however, but esteem it a most fortunate circumstance for Ministers, that the *disjecta membra* of these fugitive paragraphs, were moulded at length into something like a form, by the genius of Earl FITZWILLIAM and Mr. PATTEN. It was still more fortunate that an attempt was made to substantiate them by argument. Let us, then, hear the charge, and we shall soon be able to go through the evidence; for the heart and feelings of every man among us will at once suggest a refutation.

The substance of the charge urged against Ministers in both Houses of Parliament in the late debates, may be reduced to this—"That to obtain peace they made sacrifices; and that to maintain it, they overlooked aggressions." Happy the Minister to whom such conduct as this is imputed as a crime! Yes; God and the People will acquit Mr. ADDINGTON, for having laboured to stop the effusion of blood, the expenditure of treasure, wrung from the hard hands of his industrious countrymen. Should the modesty of Mr. ADDINGTON ever permit

mit

mit a *ſtatue* to be erected to his fame, I ſhall recommend, as an inſcription, the ſubſtance of theſe hoſtile motions—"To the MINISTER WHO RESTORED PEACE TO HIS COUNTRY, and LABOURED, AGAINST EVERY OBSTACLE, TO PRESERVE IT."

But, as the debate took ſomewhat of a wider range, let us enquire from their conduct on what foundation reſts this weighty charge of the incompetency of Miniſters. Their predeceſſors had abandoned their official ſituations, in a criſis the moſt perilous to the country that we ever have witneſſed. England was left to ſtand alone in a moſt diſaſtrous conteſt, without a ſingle Ally. Egypt, the key of our Eaſtern dominion, was in the poſſeſſion of a moſt formidable enemy. The Northern Powers were united in a confederacy, which threatened the extinction of our commerce, and the ruin of our maritime ſupremacy. Ireland, whoſe plains yet ſmoked with the blood which had been ſhed in a deſperate rebellion, was exaſperated by new complaints; the Ariſtocracy diſliked the Union; the populace were excited by the imprudent revival of the Catholic queſtion. Every expedition we had fitted out to annoy the enemy had failed, from Quiberon and the Helder, down to Cadiz and Ferrol.

If, then, Mr. ADDINGTON was not a *wiſe* and *able* Miniſter, he was certainly the moſt *fortunate* that ever held the reins of Government; and Cicero accounts *good fortune* as one of the firſt qualities in a General. He and his colleagues were ſcarcely ſeated in their reſpective offices, before the affairs of the country began to aſſume a different aſpect. The formidable confederacy which threatened our

exiſtence was broken; the Powers of the North were not merely brought to reaſon, they were bound in amity by the good conduct of our Government. The enemy was expelled from Egypt; and the people of Ireland were reconciled to the Union, and to the meaſures of Government. It has, indeed, been ſaid, that the Egyptian Expedition, &c. had been planned by the former Adminiſtration. They were, however, executed by the preſent; and whoever has ſtudied hiſtory, muſt know, that in political affairs, ſucceſs generally depends leſs upon the plan, than the mode of its execution.

Whatever opinion might be entertained by ſuch men as Mr. PATTEN and Lord TEMPLE of the capacity of Miniſters, ſuch was not the opinion entertained of them by Foreign Powers. They were reſpected and feared by the FIRST CONSUL himſelf, who, whatever may have been his crimes, is not wanting in diſcernment. The overture of Lord HAWKESBURY was received in a very different manner from our Ambaſſador at Liſle. The Peace which was concluded by them was, I aver, as good a Peace as we had a right to expect. In the relative ſituation of the two countries, we could not hope to retain the *whole* of our conqueſts: we never could do ſo, even when the country was in the moſt proſperous circumſtances, neither at the Peace of Utrecht, nor at the Peace of 1763. But if the Miniſtry had even entertained ſo irrational an expectation, there was one bar which it was impoſſible to ſurmount. The project of Liſle had defined and limited the demands of England. That we obtained *better* terms than that project contained,

ed, is a matter of ſurpriſe, and certainly ought to be placed to the credit of Miniſters.

It was not in human foreſight to diſcover, that a Treaty, concluded with apparent good faith on both ſides, and ſo agreeable to the intereſts and inclinations of both nations, was ſo ſoon to be violated. I will go further, and I will confidently pronounce my belief, that at the time of the Treaty, the FIRST CONSUL was ſincere in his profeſſions and intentions of maintaining it. Ambition, like every other human paſſion, is ſubject to the allurements of temptation. He ſaw not at the time the circumſtances that would ariſe to allure him from the line of his duty; but temptations preſented themſelves, and he found himſelf unable to reſiſt.

One evident advantage ariſing from the Treaty of Amiens, was well pointed out by Mr. Fox, in one of his ſpeeches in the beginning of the Seſſion. He ſaid, he rejoiced that the Treaty of Amiens had been concluded, becauſe it gave a decided aſſurance to Europe and this country of the pacific diſpoſition of his Majeſty's Government; and I think it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his late ſpeech, who remarked, that to this we were indebted for that unanimity which at preſent pervaded every claſs of the people. Of this, indeed, I am certain, that the People of England will truſt no Party who evince an ungovernable appetite for war; though they will cheerfully ſupport a Miniſtry which has proved its love of peace, when forced into hoſtility by the aggreſſion of the enemy.

The interval of peace was employed by the Miniſtry to the very beſt advantage, in wiſe and prudent financial regulations; in improving our commerce; and in reviſing the whole ſyſtem of the cuſ-

toms, ſo as to render it eaſy to the merchant and beneficial to the public. A tax which was odious, becauſe it was partial, and grievouſly oppreſſive and burthenſome to individuals, while it was comparatively unproductive to the State, was abandoned; and the exiſting taxes, by diſtributing them more equally, and adopting wiſe meaſures for their more effectual aſſeſſment and collection, were rendered more productive by almoſt a third. Such arrangements as theſe are no proofs of incapacity or negligence; nor will Great Britain have cauſe to repent that ſhe has a Chancellor of the Exchequer who is a good arithmetician.

In the late Negociation I cannot diſcover the ſlighteſt marks of weakneſs or incompetence on the part of Miniſters. I ſee much caution and forbearance; an anxious deſire to prevent the effuſion of blood, and all the calamities of war;—I ſee a moſt happy union of moderation and dignity; I ſee vigour without arrogance, and prudence without timidity. In the papers laid before Parliament, I will defy any man to point out a ſingle conceſſion which involves the dignity of the Country or the Government; a ſingle paſſage inconſiſtent with that ſpirit and magnanimity which it is our boaſt to maintain. In a word, they form a collection of State Papers, which any real Engliſhman may read with pleaſure and with pride.

In a future letter I ſhall enter more fully into the characters of the Miniſters, and the claims of their opponents; and, in the mean time, remain,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

June 4, 1803. VALERIUS.

LETTER II.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

IN applying the epithets *rude* and *illiberal* to the late attack upon Miniſters (I ought to ſpeak in the plural, if we include the paragraphs in the Papers, and have a regard to the quarter from which they proceeded), I would not wiſh to be miſunderſtood. Far be it from me to deny the reſponſibility of Miniſters, or the ſacred right which is veſted in Parliament, at all times, ſtrictly to inveſtigate their conduct, to petition for their removal, to *impeach* them if neceſſary. This is one of the grand bulwarks of our Conſtitution—I had almoſt called it the *palladium* of our liberties. It is the *manner* in which that right has been exerciſed, of which I complain; a manner which I believe is almoſt unprecedented, and certainly little conſiſtent with the forms of our Conſtitution in other reſpects. The humane and liberal ſpirit of the Laws of England, preſumes every man, even the vileſt of wretches, innocent, till he is proved to be guilty, on fair and competent evidence. Not to ſpeak, then, of the defamation in the public papers, I ſay, that reſolutions moved in Parliament, directly cenſuring Miniſters for incapacity and incompetence, without previouſly ſtating the evidence on which ſuch a charge was founded, was a moſt illiberal, baſe, and inſidious mode of attack, and ſuch as ought to be, and will be, reſented by a generous nation. The regular, the accuſtomed proceſs, would have been, a motion for a Committee of Enquiry. When, in

that Committee, the proofs of incompetence, had been ſubſtantiated, a reſolution of cenſure would have properly ſucceeded. But the mode of proceeding, in this inſtance, marks well the violent ſpirit of the party by whom it was ſupported; and I hope it will induce the nation "to have an eye upon them."

I am happy that the motion was met as it deſerved; I am happy that the Miniſters had the ſpirit to call for a direct deciſion, and the diſcernment to avoid the inſidious ſnare that was laid for them, when it was propoſed to ſhelter them under a fallacious ſubterfuge. Had they acted otherwiſe, this pen would never have been drawn in their defence. As it was, the night of the 3d of June was a glorious night for Mr. ADDINGTON and his colleagues. Every argument of their adverſaries proved the fallacy of the ſtatements contained in the reſolutions; and they roſe higher in the eſtimation of the public by the attempt to depreſs them. Yes! the Miniſter was found guilty, before God and his Country, of *being the uniform advocate for Peace*, the *friend* of *human kind!* He was convicted of caution, of forbearance, of an anxious ſolicitude, that the blood and treaſure of his Country ſhould not be wantonly or profuſely expended. It was proved even more forcibly by the accuſations of his enemies than by the arguments of his friends, that the conteſt in which we are unhappily involved was forced upon us; and that to avoid it, every meaſure of conciliation was tried in vain. If any ſingle circumſtance could have occurred to render the nation ſtill more united in its reſolve to oppoſe the aggreſſion of the enemy than they were before, it was this; and

it muſt unite them further in the conviction, that the Miniſter who has evinced this tender, this anxious ſolicitude for all their deareſt intereſts, is the only man in whoſe hands thoſe intereſts can be ſafely truſted.

The debate had another effect, not leſs happy for Miniſters. It ſaid for them, what they could not ſay for themſelves. It gave occaſion for the diſplay of what their merits and abilities had been, both in the conduct of a War, and in the effecting of a Peace. It ſhewed, that at their acceſſion to office, the Country was in a ſtate of difficulty and of peril unexampled within our memory. The merit and the ability of Miniſters in diſſolving at once the formidable confederacy of the North, has never been juſtly appreciated, becauſe it has been but imperfectly known. It will be my taſk one day or other to bring it before the public, who will then know, from a ſingle inſtance, whether they are to believe or not the aſſertions of Colonel PATTEN, and of Earl FITZWILLIAM, and of Lord TEMPLE, and of Mr. CANNING, and of Sir ROBERT PEELE, that they are in the hands of incompetent Miniſters!

I have ſaid in my former letter, that if Mr. ADDINGTON was not an able Stateſman, he was certainly the moſt *fortunate* of Miniſters. But when a ſeries of ſucceſs is attributed to good fortune alone, it is evident that men look to events, and not to cauſes; and the Roman orator, when, in the paſſage I alluded to, he recommends a *fortunate* General to his country, certainly does not uſe the word in the vulgar ſenſe, but would imply that there is ſomething in the habits, conduct, and foreſight of the man, which can command even Fortune

tune herſelf. It is certainly ſomething extraordinary, that all the military projects of his predeceſſors ſhould have been attended with diſappointment and diſgrace—that in the hands of Mr. ADDINGTON and his colleagues all ſhould have been ſucceſsful;—and yet, indignant reader, theſe were the men of unrivalled talents, and Mr. ADDINGTON is an incompetent Miniſter!

In politics there is no paradox which may not be explained, becauſe there every thing depends upon a knowledge of facts; and perhaps in the caſe before us, a little obſervation will enable us to unravel the difficulty. It was not my intention to have touched upon the merits or demerits of the former Miniſtry, but the turn of the debate to which I allude, obliges me to it. I ſhall, however, *for the preſent*, touch it with as light a hand as poſſible. The ſucceſs of political meaſures depends not merely on the *talents*, but on the temper, habits, and diſpoſitions of thoſe who plan and direct them. The ſplendid and the brilliant are not the only talents which are neceſſary for a great political character. They may ſhine in debate, but they will ſometimes miſlead in action. In private as well as public life, the uſeful is indeed not always the moſt dazzling. Cool judgment, penetration, diligence, activity, are the uſeful qualifications of a Stateſman; they were the characteriſtics of a XIMENES, a SULLY, a RICHELIEU, a DE WIT, and a WALPOLE. I ſhall not imitate that want of candour which I condemn in others. I am willing to allow in the utmoſt extent, that the talents of ſome who compoſed part of the late Adminiſtration were brilliant—in parliamentary debate unrivalled: but they wanted that coolneſs, ſobriety,

ſobriety, ſteadineſs—that conciliatory temper, which form the eſſential adjuncts in the character of an accompliſhed Stateſman. They were above advice, and too confident in their own opinons to wait for that neceſſary information which ſhould precede the adoption of any bold or important meaſure: they had not learned, moreover, the art or arts for a Miniſter—that of keeping a ſecret. Hence, plans of the utmoſt moment were haſtily adopted, and as haſtily abandoned; the enemy was in poſſeſſion of all their intended meaſures, and prepared to defeat them. Hence, the Powers of Europe were diſguſted, and the parties at home kept in a ſtate of irritation. In the preſent Miniſtry, firmneſs is united with candour; while, ſteady to their purpoſe, they are mild and conciliatory in their manner of enforcing it. They are manly, frank and open, on every ſubject, where the intereſts of the State, and the principles of honour, will admit it; they have, at the ſame time, the prudence to keep cautiouſly from the public view what ought not to be expoſed. Had the former Adminiſtration been guided by ſuch principles, it cannot be doubted but we might have had Peace before we obtained it; and we might, perhaps, have had it on more advantageous terms.

That the Peace of Amiens ſhould not prove a laſting Peace, was what no politician that ever exiſted could poſſibly have foreſeen. It depended upon the vacillations of ſentiment in a moſt extraordinary character; a character not leſs remarkable for the capriciouſneſs of his humour, and the eccentricity of his paſſions, than for his great abilities. Whoever contemplates with an obſerving eye,

eye, the conduct of the FIRST CONSUL towards the Britiſh, and ſince that (if the report be true) towards the Ruſſian Ambaſſador, cannot be ſurpriſed that the ſame man ſhould at one period be deſirous of Peace, and at another equally deſirous of its violation. Every intereſt of France, every perſonal intereſt, ſhould have induced him to preſerve Peace with England. This was all for which human foreſight could provide: and it was impoſſible for Miniſters to pledge themſelves, that a character, which is ſo manifeſtly under the guidance of the moſt violent of paſſions, ſhould uniformly act under the influence of reaſon and virtue.

Yet, what have we loſt by the Peace? Our reſources are not diminiſhed; the energy and confidence of the people are increaſed, in a tenfold proportion. All parties, except the few inſulated individuals who are panting for office, are united; and the ſpirit of the nation is "as one man."

June 7th, 1803. VALERIUS.

LETTER III.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

IN the preſent wavering and unſettled ſtate of Parties, it is not ſurpriſing that new ſubjects ſhould almoſt daily ariſe to divert my attention from that which was the firſt object of my correſpondence with you. The adverſaries of Miniſtry, to whom I am willing to allow ſome degree of talent—that which accompliſhes an Old Bailey Solicitor—are continually ſhifting their ground. With the activity of the French tactics, which they pretend to diſavow, when forced to abandon one ſtation, they retreat to another; and when beaten from the glacis, take ſhelter in the covered way.

When the principle on which they firſt inculpated Miniſters,—that of not having entered into war upon the firſt opportunity that preſented itſelf for a quarrel—was no longer tenable; when it was found that the People and Parliament of England would not liſten to thoſe violent and arrogant counſels, that would plunge the nation into hoſtilities, without any rational ground of diſpute, a new doctrine was broached. *New*, perhaps, I ought not to call it, ſince it coincided, in a great meaſure, with the pompous and arrogant ſtyle of the GRENVILLE Adminiſtration; a ſtyle, the indulgence of which coſt this nation oceans of blood, and millions of treaſure. The doctrine is ſomewhat metaphyſical, not level to the plain ſenſe and undebauched underſtandings of the People of England; and I perceive the advocates of

of Oppoſition find that the ſpeeches of their leaders ſtand in need of a comment to make them underſtood.

Since the People and Parliament of England have unequivocally declared their deſire of Peace, and their diſlike of War, it is now pretended that "the conduct of Miniſters, in not remonſtrating againſt the aggreſſions and inſults of France, as they took place, was calculated to lead to War at laſt; whereas, had they acted with vigour, an appeal to arms *might* have been unneceſſary."* Unfortunately for this propoſition, it is (like their former) *not true* in any of its parts; and it is produced, either in the hope that it will not be underſtood (as the ſpeech of the Noble Lord who introduced the doctrine by their own confeſſion was not), or on the preſumption that we have not read the papers which were laid before Parliament. It is *not true*, that any one of the aggreſſions or inſults of France towards this country, was paſſed over without remonſtrance—without ſtrong, dignified, ſpirited remonſtrance. That Miniſters did not diſgrace themſelves by the uſe of indecent and opprobrious language, ſuch as we have ſeen (but never till theſe latter days) in other State Papers, may be true; but the language which they employed produced in ſome inſtances redreſs, in all apology. Even the report of SEBASTIANI was diſavowed, and was excuſed, upon the remonſtrance of the Miniſters. But the deſigns of France became then too apparent, and Adminiſtration found it neceſſary to require ſomething more than the pledge of words and of aſſurances—to require

* See the commentary on Lord GRENVILLE's Speech of Monday, in that luminous print the Morning Chronicle.

require a ſubſtantial pledge—and that pledge was the poſſeſſion of Malta.

I am ready to grant, that the *dexterity* of Lord GRENVILLE, who ſeems to take pride in appropriating to himſelf the character under which Mr. BURKE delineated the Revolutioniſts of France, an *architect of ruin*; that dexterity, which fabricated the coarſe and vulgar replies to the pacific overtures of LE BRUN and of BONAPARTE, at a time when the pride of France was humbled, and when the inſecure tenure of a newly eſtabliſhed Government might have inſured us the moſt advantageous terms; that dexterity, which conſiſts only in blowing the paſſions of rival nations into a flame, would, have employed very differeent language. But ſhall I, for this, conſider Lord GRENVILLE as a ſtateſman? I never did; I never could conſider him in that light. I never could read one of his diſpatches, or hear one of his ſpeeches, without being involuntarily reminded of a character in JOHNSON*. Such ſtateſmen as Lord GRENVILLE never could give us peace; and, if we may judge from his adminiſtration, never could conduct a war to any happy concluſion. As a good ſubject to his MAJESTY, as a friend to my Country, I never wiſh to ſee ſuch *ſtateſmen* employed; ſtateſmen who are unacquainted with the politeneſs, with the decencies of diplomatic intercourſe. Theſe are the *incompetent* ſtateſmen, who would only excite the ridicule of thoſe who really deſerved the name.

I muſt again repeat it, the character of a ſtateſman does not conſiſt in the power of pronouncing long, pompous, and inane declamations in Parliament,

* The angry Boy.

ment, or in ſigning haughty and diſguſting manifeſtoes. It conſiſts in a mind that calculates before it proceeds to action (and words are actions when they paſs between contending Courts); in a mind firm to its purpoſe, but moderate and gentle in its means—*ſuaviter in modo, fortiter in re*—a trite adage, but not the leſs true for that; in a mind that does not conſider the intereſts of nations as a tennis-ball to be played with upon every occaſion; that will not commit the welfare of a country on a ſingle angry expreſſion, or perhaps on an inadvertent breach of decorum. In private life, thoſe are the wiſeſt, as well as the beſt of men, who have learned to controul the iraſcible paſſions; the moderate man is reſpected in all the walks of life; he is feared *becauſe he is moderate*, and becauſe it is known that what he ſpeaks he will act; but the bully is deſpiſed, not leſs in a public than a private capacity.

If the *new* diplomatic doctrine be true, either ſtateſmen are to threaten what they do not mean to do; or (which I take to be the meaning of the paradox, for ſuch it ſtill remains, notwithſtanding the ſage commentary of the Morning Chronicle,) "to avoid hoſtilities, we are to ruſh precipitately into them." But this is correſpondent to all the reaſoning of the Party; and to ſuch men we are not ſurpriſed that our preſent Miniſters appear *incompetent*.

From ſuch crude politics as theſe, every intelligent perſon, every man converſant in hiſtory, will turn with diſguſt. The more he reads the papers ſubmitted to Parliament, the more cauſe he will find to applaud the wiſe, the liberal, the frank, the truly ENGLISH ſpirit manifeſted on this occaſion by

by our Miniſtry. He will find there, no intrigue, no ſubterfuge, no evaſion of any queſtion. He will find every act of aggreſſion remonſtrated againſt in manly, but decent language; every reaſonable bar to reconciliation removed, and the matter in diſpute at length fairly brought to an iſſue.

If Mr. Fox continues to think (and his ſpeech on Tueſday at the Whig Club profeſſes the ſame ſentiments as are contained in his ſpeech in Parliament) that Miniſters have acted with *too much vigour*; and if Lord GRENVILLE and Earl FITZWILLIAM think they have acted with *too little*, how ſhall we reconcile the diſcordant opinions of theſe politicians? I believe, Sir, the public opinion will be found to be ſounder and more rational than either. That opinion is, or I am much deceived, that Miniſters have preſerved a happy medium between the two extremes; that they have conceded as far as they ought; that they have reluctantly unſheathed the ſword, but they have unſheathed it with dignity.

June 8th, 1803. VALERIUS.

LETTER IV.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

TO a liberal mind it will always afford more ſincere ſatisfaction to do juſtice to merit, than to refute or expoſe impoſture or error. I haſten, therefore, with ſome pleaſure, to fulfil that part of my engagement to you and the public, which promiſed a free but liberal enquiry into the character and competence of Miniſters. I muſt, however, premiſe, that I am moſt cordially agreed with the moſt ſtrenuous opponent of Adminiſtration, in the neceſſity there is, that, at a criſis like the preſent, men of talents and of virtue ought to be employed; and give me leave to add a moſt ſolemn declaration, that if I believed any other *ſet of men* could more effectually ſerve their King and Country, I would not recommend the preſent Miniſtry to the approbation and ſupport of my fellow ſubjects.

In uſing the phraſe a *ſet* of *men*, I am conſcious that I expoſe myſelf to the imputation of a vulgariſm; but I have employed theſe words, becauſe no other in the language could ſo completely expreſs my opinion. A Miniſtry, like an army, to be really efficient, muſt act in uniſon—muſt, in the language of the Royal Exchange, "underſtand each other." I have heard much on the ſubject of an Adminiſtration, on a broad baſis, to include the talents, influence, and experience of all parties. I have ſeen ſuch experiments tried; and tried at the expence of the nation. The Marquis of ROCKINGHAM's firſt Adminiſtration, in 1766, was formed by what is called a union of parties; it

it included the GRENVILLE and NEWCASTLE parties: but it was of ſhort duration, and is characteriſed by JUNIUS, who was himſelf one of the party, as "Lord ROCKINGHAM's *feeble* Adminiſtration." The Miniſtry which was formed by Lord CHATHAM in the ſucceeding year, was conſtituted on a ſimilar plan; but even his great talents were unable to preſerve union among them, and they diſſolved before the end of the year, with little credit to themſelves, or benefit to the nation. The ſecond Miniſtry, marſhalled under the auſpices of Lord ROCKINGHAM in 1782, was alſo created by a coalition with the remnants of the CHATHAM, the GRENVILLE, and the BEDFORD intereſts: but it was a rope of ſand, and was broken to atoms by the ſudden death of the principal perſonage, the Marquis himſelf. We all remember well the conduct and the fate of the notorious Coalition Miniſtry in 1783 and 1784:—and theſe examples, without recurring to perhaps a ſtill ſtronger inſtance in the preceding reign, may ſerve to ſhew the fallacy of that ſplendid illuſion, a Miniſtry formed by a ſelection of the great men of all parties—a plan which may furniſh a pompous paragraph for a newspaper, or ſerve to decorate a parliamentary declamation, but in practice has ever been found nugatory and abſurd.

If the charge of incapacity or incompetence had been directed againſt any particular branch of the public Adminiſtration, the truth or falſehood of the allegation might be brought to more ſpeedy deciſion; but the *ignis fatuus*, which is to miſlead, ſhines only in a miſt; and thoſe who have a bad cauſe to ſupport, "love the darkneſs better than the light." They employ only looſe, vague, ge-

neral aſſertions. This ſaves them the trouble of proof, and they can aſperſe without danger of detection. To the preſent CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER all parties are agreed in according the praiſe of unſuſpected integrity, of unoſtentatious virtue. Now, Sir, I am at a loſs to know how the moſt exalted of the moral qualities can exiſt in a *public* character without an adequate portion of underſtanding. Virtue is not altogether the reſult of feeling or of temper; it derives its utility and its conſequence from a ſound judgment united with good principles. "*Non divitiis cum divite, neque factione cum factioſo; ſed cum ſtrennuo virtute, cum modeſto pudore; cum innocente abſtinentia certabat: eſſe, quam videri, bonus malebat,*" was ſaid of not only the beſt but the *greateſt* man in the Roman republic. To move, indeed, in an elevated ſphere, without being corrupted by thoſe temptations with which it is beſet; to have riſen to greatneſs, without thoſe mean condeſcenſions which have ſullied the early progreſs of ſome brilliant characters; to have the diſpoſal of patronage and of treaſure, without the ſuſpicion of avarice; to occupy a ſtation which commands the adulation of nations, and yet riſe ſuperior to the paſſions of vanity or pride; theſe are certainly no marks of a weak or a little mind. Is that candour and frankneſs, on which his opponents themſelves cannot help complimenting the Miniſter, no proof of greatneſs? It may not be ſo in the *new ſchool*, where haughtineſs is miſtaken for dignity, inſolence for ſpirit, and pertneſs for wit: but according to the old-faſhioned notions of thoſe who have ſtudied hiſtory, and read mankind, theſe, in ſpite of Mr. CANNING and Col. PATTEN,

PATTEN, will infallibly rank among the qualifications of a great man.

The popularity of Mr. ADDINGTON, I am ready to allow, has arisen in a great measure from the confidence the public has placed in his unblemished character. The sentiment does honour to the moral feelings of the nation, and proves that Englishmen have lost neither their virtue nor their judgment. To me, Sir, I own it is pleasant, and I am sorry to add it is *new*, to hear a Minister express himself with modesty; address the Commons of Great Britain as his equals, not his servants; and profess himself open to advice from whatever quarter it proceeds; and I transcribe with particular satisfaction a passage from the *Morning Chronicle* of this day, as exhibiting the picture of a mind above the littleness of self-conceit, of what a Minister of this country ought to be:—"The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (in reply to some observations of Mr. W. SMITH) professed himself extremely unwilling to recommend any tax which might be unfair or inconvenient towards any description of the community. He wished that the wants of the State might be supplied with as little inconvenience to the people as possible ——. He admitted that, in the disclosure of the circumstances of men in business, it was highly desirable it should be done with every possible accommodation to the feelings of individuals, and he invited Gentlemen to suggest such means as might occur to their minds as likely to facilitate the collection of the tax, and avert vexation or trouble; for he could assure the House that nothing was further from the wishes of Ministers, than in the slightest degree to outrage the

public feelings, by preſſing forward any obnoxious meaſure. It was, on the contrary, their firſt and moſt anxious deſire to have their feelings with them, not only as to the cauſe of the war, and the principles on which it was to be conducted, but as to the mode of contribution neceſſary to its ſupport: for they were juſtly impreſſed with the conviction, that without the concurrence of public ſentiment, Government muſt be weak indeed; but that, ſeconded by its influence, it would be fully competent to ſurmount every danger, and to vanquiſh every difficulty which the war might preſent."

In common with the reſt of his Majeſty's Servants, Mr. ADDINGTON partakes in the praiſe of having conducted the public affairs with honour and proſperity; but this ſubject has been diſcuſſed in my former Letters, and is, I apprehend, too firmly impreſſed on the minds of my countrymen, to require a repetition.

It is long ſince I have been in the habit of attending the debates of Parliament. I have ſeen the preſent CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER fill the Chair of ONSLOW with dignity. I have heard him expound the Law of Parliament, and the Conſtitution of the Country, with force and preciſion; but I have not contemplated him in his new character. To borrow a phraſe from the theatre, of which the exhibitions at St. Stephen's ſometimes involuntarily reminds us, I have not ſeen him on the *boards*. He ſeems, indeed, to think it no part of the duty of a Miniſter to practiſe the arts of a teacher of rhetoric, to ſtudy florid ſpeeches for the amuſement of the gallery, or to waſte that time in the battles of the tongue, which he owes to his Country;

Country. Yet, if we may truſt the reports of the debates, which are publiſhed in the newſpapers of both parties, his ſpeeches, though not long, are clear, ſenſible, and immediately to the point; they are the ſpeeches of a man of buſineſs; they diſplay a ſound judgment, without the wiſh to miſlead or overbear the judgment of others; they are replete with information, without the affectation of ſuperior knowledge. How far he may poſſeſs, what in the eſtimation of the honeſt Cheeſemonger* were the only requiſites for a teacher of others, "voice and action;" how far he may excel in the ſcenic accompliſhments of a modern Stateſman, I am, for the reaſons already aſſigned, unqualified to determine: nor can I conceive that it is a queſtion in which the nation is very deeply intereſted.

Of the Secretary for the Foreign Department I can conſcientiouſly declare, and I do it without much expectation of contradiction, that, in my opinion, his MAJESTY could not have found a man equally qualified for that ſituation. His firſt eſſay in Parliament, I remember, aſtoniſhed the veteran Stateſmen of the time, by a moſt extenſive and correct knowledge of the political intereſts of Europe; by the clearneſs of his views, and the acuteneſs of his concluſions. From that period his opinion has been regarded with the higheſt reſpect by every Adminiſtration, on every ſubject where foreign politics are concerned. He poſſeſſes the *temper* too, as well as the genius and knowledge of a Stateſman; and, whatever Lord GRENVILLE may think of the matter, his correſpondence during the late Negociation, will ſtand

 upon

* See a Letter to a Biſhop concerning Lectureſhips.

upon record as unqueſtionable evidence of his diplomatic abilities.

I have not heard any accuſation alleged againſt the Noble Lord who preſides over the Maritime Affairs of the Nation, except that he has been *too active* in the detection of peculation, and in the prevention of fraud. On this charge I am inclined to think the country, which has to pay for the profuſion or negligence of Miniſters, will be diſpoſed to grant him an acquittal. Of his experience and ability in his profeſſional line, no man can entertain a doubt; and of his judgment and abilities, Mr. Fox himſelf has expreſſed the warmeſt admiration.

The higher offices of the Law are ſurely occupied by men of confeſſedly ſuperior abilities. The Bar and the Nation have long looked up to Sir JOHN SCOTT as the worthy ſucceſſor of his friend and early patron, Lord THURLOW; and thoſe who have felt the weight and poignancy of the ſarcaſtic eloquence of Lord ELLLENBOROUGH, will not, I apprehend, be haſtily diſpoſed to queſtion his talents.

The other official ſituations, are, I apprehend, to the full, as reſpectably filled at preſent as they uſually are. The SECRETARY at WAR may be leſs capable than Mr. WINDHAM of entertaining the Houſe by the eccentricity of his opinions and the *novelty* * of his jokes: and the Under Secretaries may not poſſeſs the perſevering loquacity of Mr. CANNING. The former, however, is univerſally allowed to be a man of excellent talents, and of

* The Author probably means agreeably to the old ſign-poſt inſcription, "new revived;" ſince moſt of them are to be found in a very old and uſeful Author, "Joe Miller."

of unwearied application; nor have I heard of the ſlighteſt neglect of the public intereſts in any department whatever.

Till our adverſaries, then, can produce ſome ſpecific charge, which indicates clearly the incapacity or the negligence of the preſent Miniſters, I ſhall conclude that they employ *general* abuſe, becauſe they have nothing better to ſay; and I am confirmed in this opinion by obſerving that the language is the very ſame by which the Adminiſtrations of WALPOLE, of NORTH, of SHELBURNE, and of PITT, were formerly aſſailed:

> "The *coxcomb bird* ſo talkative and grave,
> "That from his cage cries cuckold, whore, and knave,
> "Though many a paſſenger he rightly call,
> "I hold him no philoſopher at all."

June 15, 1803. VALERIUS.

LETTER

LETTER V.

TO THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

COUNTRYMEN AND FRIENDS,

WHEN you have the misfortune to be engaged in a war; when heavy burdens are to be borne, and many privations endured to maintain it; there is the utmoſt reaſon that you ſhould be convinced of its abſolute neceſſity, that you ſhould have the moſt ſatisfactory information concerning the grounds and reaſons for an event in which you are ſo deeply intereſted.

To thoſe who have had leiſure attentively to peruſe the public Papers relative to the Negociation with France, no argument will be wanting to ſatisfy them that to us the calamity (for it would be trifling with you to call it by any other name) was altogether unavoidable; that we have been reduced to the ſad neceſſity of having recourſe to arms in our own defence, to repel the encroaching ambition, and the reſtleſs malignity of an inveterate enemy, who hates the name and Government of Britain, only becauſe Britain is free; becauſe every act of its Government is an indirect cenſure on the abominable tyranny of his own.

I had hoped, indeed, that the aggreſſion of the FIRST CONSUL was evident to every individual both in France and England*; I had believed that not an argument could be urged in favour of the French Government. In this latter opinion I am not

* Mr. FOX did not deny this, but thought the Negotiation might have been protracted with a proſpect of adjuſtment.

not deceived, if the word *argument* be taken in its legitimate ſenſe. But when the groſſeſt falſehood is united with the moſt contemptible ſophiſtry to miſlead you, or rather to miſlead the unfortunate people of France and Holland, (for it cannot impoſe on Engliſhmen) ſome notice ought to be taken, even though the compoſition in other reſpects is too contemptible for a reply.

You will eaſily perceive that I allude to the obſervations lately publiſhed by the French Government upon his MAJESTY's Declaration. I ſhall not imitate the declamatory ſtyle of theſe obſervations, for truth appears beſt in the plaineſt garb; and this is a queſtion not to be decided by rhetorical flouriſhes, but by argument and fact.

The French Government commences with denying, in the *groſſeſt* of terms, the allegations contained in his MAJESTY's Declaration; and with charging both your KING and his Miniſters with palpable falſehood. Here you have the *veracity* and *moral character* of the two Governments oppoſed to each other: your good, your mild, your honourable, your conſtitutional SOVEREIGN, oppoſed to a Corſican tyrant and uſurper; Mr. ADDINGTON to Monſ. TALLEYRAND. Can you, can the people of France, heſitate a ſingle moment which to believe?

Compare the maxims of the two Governments: the one founded by uſurpation on the ruins equally of the antient Monarchy, and of the newly-conſtituted Republic; governing without a trial by jury, indeed without any legal trial at all, by arbitrary arreſts, impriſonments, tranſportations, by the moſt diabolical degradation of the moral principle,

ciple, *poiſon* * and aſſaſſination. In this happy country we can ſpeak, we can write what we pleaſe; we are ſubject only to the controul of the laws: and thoſe laws adminiſtered by twelve honeſt men, our equals, our countrymen, indifferently choſen from the maſs of the freeholders. In France the preſs is ſilenced, and thought itſelf is hardly free. No man's houſe is his caſtle; it is filled with ſpies and delators.—Which Government, then, evinces guilt, and fear, and ſuſpicion? and of what are theſe the natural concomitants—of falſehood or of truth? The morality of the two Governments will bear no compariſon; and the argument, *a priori* at leaſt, makes directly againſt the veracity of the *Hero* of *Jaffa*.

But let us come to the *facts* inſtanced by the French Government, for we cannot anſwer declamation. The firſt circumſtance alluded to, is the ſtate of commerce between the two countries: but here, to my utmoſt ſurpriſe, inſtead of a confutation, I find a point-blank avowal of what is ſtated in his MAJESTY's Declaration. The FIRST CONSUL, or whoever for him wrote theſe obſervations, confeſſes that *no Treaty of Commerce* was negociated, or ſought to be negociated, by France with England: on the contrary, the writer exclaims, "Can we not trade without a Treaty of Commerce with England!" Not, ſurely, if laws enacted in war, laws enacted during the reign of anarchy and terror, are to be enforced during peace. I admit, with this writer, that if France continued to prohibit Engliſh

* See what is ſaid in Captain D'AUVERGNE's Narrative of the *Ragouts Italiens*; and his deſcription of the New Baſtille, the Temple.

Engliſh merchandize, England might, in return, prohibit the merchandize of France. But is this a ſtate of commerce—of free and reciprocal commerce? I will admit further with him, that this alone was not a juſtifiable cauſe for war; but did it manifeſt an amicable diſpoſition on the part of the French Government?

The next ſubject reſpects the pretended *Commercial Agents*; but here alſo is a frank confeſſion of every tittle alledged in his MAJESTY's Declaration, that the majority of them were military men, and that the orders found upon one of theſe ſpies were actually iſſued by the Cabinet of the Thuilleries. The action is juſtified by the aſſertion, that France has ſent to *every part of the world* commercial agents inveſted with ſimilar authorities. With all my heart, let the other powers of Europe, if they chooſe, admit French Officers to ſound their harbours, and make drawings of their ports; but I hope never to ſee any ſuch tolerated in Old England.

We are further informed, with the *utmoſt gravity*, "that the French army has not remained in Holland in defiance of ſtipulations, but in conformity with the ſtipulations of a treaty with the Government of that Republic."—To what ſtipulations the wretched and oppreſſed Batavians might be forced by the point of the bayonet we cannot ſay: we only aſſert, that this conduct was a *direct violation* of open treaties, made under the guarantee of the other Powers of Europe; that it was a manifeſt violation of the rights of an independent nation. But to put the truth and reaſonableneſs of this aſſertion to the teſt; let BONAPARTE once *withdraw his troops from Holland*, and then ſee whether

whether the Dutch will be forward in negociating a treaty for their return.

The writer with equal ſolemnity remarks, "That it is not incumbent on the French Government to be informed of the Engliſh Conſtitution." I did, really, never ſuſpect General BONAPARTE of any deſire to be informed of the principles of the Engliſh, or any other *free* Conſtitution. He has ſufficiently ſhewn his deteſtation of every thing that bears the name of liberty. He has ſhewn himſelf ignorant of the principles of Government altogether. Happy would it have been for France, if he would have devoted a little time to the ſtudy of the Engliſh Conſtitution; happier ſtill, if he had had the honeſty to practiſe its principles!

The latter part of theſe curious obſervations goes to retort the charge upon the Engliſh Government, of wiſhing to retain the poſſeſſion of Egypt. Now it is a little remarkable, that the FIRST CONSUL ſhould have expreſſed, in *direct terms*, ſuch a wiſh, and ſuch an intention; and that the Engliſh Government ſhould never have diſcloſed, either in words or actions, that they were actuated by any ſuch idea. "But the ſtay of the Engliſh army in Egypt was protracted:" if there is any circumſtance that reflects peculiar honour on the Britiſh character, it is the continuance of the Britiſh army in Egypt, with great inconvenience to themſelves, and expence to the nation. I am proud of the circumſtance; and, my Countrymen, every individual among you has a right to be proud of it. The Britiſh army ſtaid in Egypt to *prevent maſſacre*, *bloodſhed*, *civil war*; the miſeries of deſolation, the horrors of exaggerated cruelty. All of you, who have read Sir

ROBERT

Robert Wilson's Narrative, or who are in the leaſt acquainted with political affairs, muſt be informed of the melancholy event, which ended in the maſſacre of ſome of the principal Mameluke Beys; you muſt know that many others of them were impriſoned; and great numbers had retired towards the confines of Upper Egypt, from a diſtruſt of the Ottoman Government. I wiſh to caſt no blame upon that Government. Jealouſies will ariſe between parties, without a treacherous intention on either ſide. It is ſufficient that implacable jealouſies had ariſen, and that the moſt deplorable cataſtrophe ſeemed to impend over that unhappy country, which, by the perfidious invaſion of Bonaparte, had already ſuffered enough. The Britiſh army was the only mediating Power that could prevent theſe moſt calamitous conſequences; the Britiſh General ſtaid as the Angel and Miniſter of Peace. He reſcued from oppreſſion and from death, thoſe who were already plunged in the gulphs of deſpair; by his authority, he reſtored tranquillity at leaſt, if not perfect confidence; he eſtabliſhed the doubtful rights of the contending parties on a firm baſis; and left the country with the thanks, the prayers, the bleſſings of all its inhabitants*.

To diſmiſs this miſerable paper (which perhaps has occupied already more time than it deſerved), in a few words: conſidering the character of the Chief Consul, and his hoſtility to England, ſo repeatedly manifeſted; conſidering the ſtrong deſire which he formerly ſhewed, and ſo recently avowed, to be in poſſeſſion of Egypt; if

* Theſe obſervations have been amply juſtified by the events which have taken place ſince the Britiſh army was withdrawn.

if in the exiſting circumſtances your Miniſters had ſurrendered Malta, and at a future period the First Consul had taken advantage of this conceſſion, and poſſeſſed himſelf of Egypt, with a view certainly of annoying your Indian Colonies; what would you have thought of your Miniſters, and what would have been the reſponſibility which they would have incurred?

With reſpect to the threats of the First Consul, I confeſs my mind is very tranquil. The invaſion of England is an atchievement eaſy to talk of, but difficult to accompliſh. By the grand and ſpiirited meaſure of laſt night, you will have ſuch a native force well trained and diſciplined, as would reſiſt the force of united Europe, could even a landing be effected for ſuch a body of men as were likely to make any impreſſion.—Why! let him come! He will find a million of loyal ſubjects, with arms in their hands, and Britiſh hearts in their boſoms; and the valour that defeated his Invincibles in Egypt, will drive his Conſcripts to ſeek their deſtruction in the ocean.

In the mean time, he may take violent poſſeſſion of the peaceful and defenceleſs cities of the Continent: but the French muſt have your manufactures, and they will find their way. In the mean time, you will ſucceſſively gain poſſeſſion of every foreign colony belonging to your enemy, and his forced, his *victim* allies. Your ſails will cover the ocean; and the fruits of a commerce, which will be even extended by the ſucceſſes of a naval warfare, will amply defray the expences of the conteſt.

June 21. VALERIUS.

LET-

LETTER VI.

To the Right Hon. the LORD MAYOR of LONDON.

MY LORD,

I AM truly concerned to find any thing to cenſure in the proceedings of the Citizens of London, a body of men whom faction may ſometimes miſlead, but in whom the ſpirit of patriotiſm can never be extinct. The proceedings at the late Common Hall were, however, ſuch as muſt wound the feelings of every real Engliſhman, and, I fear, are too much calculated to raiſe the hopes of an inveterate and rapacious enemy. Though I do not conſider a majority of a Common Hall, (unſelect as thoſe meetings uſually are,) as a fair repreſentation of the Livery of London, yet I muſt regret that any body of men could be found in the Country, at ſuch a criſis, actuated by any other principle than that of zeal and enthuſiaſm in the public cauſe. One expreſſion* was indeed ſo groſs, that it was not to be endured; and it is ſome conſolation, that even an aſſembly brought together, I have reaſon to think, for the purpoſe of embarraſſing the Government, could not bear to hear that their Country "did not deſerve to be ſaved!"

A Morning Paper has repreſented your Lordſhip, and one of your colleagues, as having promiſed to oppoſe the tax on Property with all your power, as a tax of a "grievous and partial nature." This, however, is contradicted by other ſtatements, and I have reaſon to think the report erroneous; but if theſe were not your ſentiments, you owe to yourſelf and to your Country a direct diſavowal

* It was ſaid to have been employed by a Gentleman of the name of TRAVERS, formerly a candidate for the city.

of them on the firſt opportunity that preſents itſelf. But though this might not be the language of your Lordſhip, or the other Gentleman alluded to, it was certainly that of the Party who propoſed and carried the reſolutions, and is conſiſtent with that of the reſolutions themſelves.

I confeſs, my Lord, that I know of no Tax, likely to be productive, and ſuited to the preſent exigency, which would not be *grievous*. I queſtion whether Mr. WAITHMAN himſelf, if he were "Chancellor of the Exchequer," could propoſe any which would not be liable to the ſame objection. If, indeed, the ingenuity of that Gentleman could deviſe an unobjectionable mode of contributing to the neceſſary ſupplies, it is as much his duty to propoſe it now, as if he were in the Right Honourable ſituation to which he alluded, and which, I dare ſay, his *patriotiſm* would not ſuffer him to decline, were it offered to him by his MAJESTY. That *patriotiſm* would ſurely prompt him to offer it, could he ſuggeſt any unexceptionable plan; and, as he has not done it, I humbly conceive he does not know of any better.

That a tax upon income is *partial* I deny, except in the ſuppoſition that it is eluded by an evaſion, which, in a moral ſenſe, is equivalent to perjury. I know it has been ſaid, that an annual income, ariſing from commerce and induſtry, ought not to be as deeply taxed as permanent income, and there is ſomething ſpecious in the objection; yet, if we conſider how landed income is already burthened, and that it is only on his *net* income that the trader is required to make his return, I apprehend the landed and trading intereſts will ſtand upon a more equal footing than at firſt ſight may appear;

appear; and that though the income of the trader may be leſs certain, the landholder actually pays proportionably more towards the ſupport of Government. A tax-bill which departs from the principle of ſimplicity, will, in many caſes, be troubleſome and vexatious, and in ſtill more will be nugatory; there are caſes in which it would be equally equitable to exempt landed as trading income; but to reach all theſe caſes, the Bill muſt be clogged with trifling, and, perhaps, inconſiſtent clauſes, and a way muſt be opened to innumerable deceptions and frauds. The Act, at the worſt, is to be only temporary; the tax is to ceaſe with the war; and *its duration will therefore depend upon the People themſelves, and upon the ſpirit with which the exertions of Government are ſupported.*

The tax is alſo complained of as of an "inquiſitorial nature." So are many other taxes, which are not complained of at all; ſuch are all, in ſhort, where the individual is called upon to make a return to the aſſeſſors. I never heard of an inſtance where making a return of income was attended with the ſlighteſt injury to any perſon whatever; and it would only have been fair in the opponents of the meaſure to have ſtated them, if any ſuch inſtances were to be found. I have, however, no objection, and I dare believe that Government has no objection, to any precautions that can be propoſed for preventing the diſcloſure of the circumſtances of perſons in trade.—Such a clamour as this was at firſt raiſed againſt the Exciſe; it was deprecated as "inquiſitorial and unconſtitutional;" it is now found to be not only one of the moſt productive branches of the public revenue, but the cheapeſt and eaſieſt in the collection; and our Conſtitu-

tion remains unimpaired, though the Exciſe Duties have increaſed with the wealth of the nation.

But if the tax in queſtion were even more grievous than it is repreſented, it would be folly (I had almoſt ſaid wickedneſs) at ſuch a criſis as this, to impede its operation. This is a time not for deliberation, but for action. The war has come upon us unexpectedly, and it could not be ſuppoſed that any miniſtry could, in every inſtance, be prepared with reſpect to the moſt unexceptionable means of its ſupport. Let the tax be tried at leaſt for a year; there will be time enough before the next Seſſion of Parliament to enquire whether any impoſt can be deviſed leſs onerous to the nation. We have no right to ſuppoſe, from the temper and ſpirit of the preſent Adminiſtration, that they are fond of oppreſſion; or that they will not attend to any propoſal for the eaſe and benefit of the People.

In the mean time, my Lord, it would be diſhoneſty to diſſemble the danger that beſets us. It would be abuſing the confidence of the Public; it would be treating them as children, not as Engliſhmen, to tell them that the country is not in a ſtate of peril, ſuch as has not impended over it for more than a century, perhaps ſince the reign of Elizabeth. A tyrant, deſperate from his ſituation, and intoxicated by ſucceſs; a military tyrant, who, wielding without controul the force of a mighty empire, has trampled on all the Powers of the Continent, threatens your very exiſtence. The malignant blows which he has aimed at your commerce, may ſerve to convince you of his temper and deſigns. But the ruin of your trade will not ſatisfy his envy and ambition. Thoſe laws which are the bulwark of liberty, the ſecurity of your perſons, he

muſt demoliſh; that property, which is the honourable fruit of your induſtry, he muſt plunder. I ſpeak it from *unqueſtionable* authority, and aſſert it as a fact, that in the former war, when an invaſion was planned againſt this country, one part of the plan was, that *the City of London was to be given up to plunder*; and in this manner the daring and ſavage adventurers were to be compenſated.

Have we reaſon, then, to ſuppoſe the tyrant more lenient than before? Can we flatter ourſelves, from what we have heard or ſeen of him in Egypt, in Switzerland, in Holland, or even in France, that he would treat us with moderation or honour, if we were once in his power? He, who maſſacres his captives; he, who poiſons his own troops; he, who fills the deſarts of Guiana, and the dungeons of France, with the victims of his power and his hatred; and in theſe dark abodes of miſery adminiſters the deadly draught to the moſt obnoxious of his opponents;* will he ſhew mercy to the deteſted Engliſh? I am, however, not one of thoſe who are inclined to deſpair of their country. I know and feel, that Britons are ſtill abundantly capable of making the tyrant repent his raſhneſs, ſhould he attempt the dangerous project of an invaſion; but our ſucceſs muſt, (under Providence) depend upon ourſelves; upon our own unanimity and ſpirit. In ſuch a criſis as this, then, ſurely to endeavour to embarraſs the Government by petty objections to its meaſures, or to divide the country into parties, cannot be conſiſtent with patriotiſm or honour.

From the City of London I had expected very

 different

* See what is ſaid of the *Ragouts Italiens* by Captain D'Auvergne; alſo what is reported of the fate of Toussaint.

different proceedings; inſtead of oppoſition, I had looked for patriotic offerings.* Even the wretched and proſtrate City of Paris can vote ſhips and men to aid its tyrant in his malicious deſigns; and the City of London, the firſt in opulence, and diſtinguiſhed by its liberality, votes inſtructions to its Members to oppoſe a meaſure of Government abſolutely neceſſary at a moment of the moſt imminent danger!

One more remark I cannot omit, for it cannot be too deeply impreſſed upon the public mind: It is, that a ſpirited reſiſtance, the preſenting at this moment a firm and a fearleſs front to the enemy, will diſconcert his projects, and diſhearten him from the further proſecution of his hoſtile deſigns. Nothing can ſo much facilitate the return of Peace as great and ſpirited exertions at this period of the war; it is ſuch a conduct that muſt afford us not only a ſpeedy, but an advantageous and a durable Peace.

Should this Addreſs have any effect in awakening the public ſpirit, the high ſpirit of this great City, which has never before been dormant on any occaſion which called for exertion, I ſhall feel that I have performed a ſervice of no little importance to my Country. You, my Lord, I believe, will not be backward in forwarding any meaſure for the public ſafety; what meaſures may be moſt adviſeable I will not preſume to dictate; but if your aid is to be efficient, remember it muſt be prompt.

London, July 2, 1803. VALERIUS.

LET-

* The ſubſequent conduct of the City of London has ſhewn that ſuch expectations were not formed in vain.

LETTER VII.

TO THE PEOPLE.

FRIENDS AND COUNTRYMEN,

THOUGH the title which I have prefixed to this Letter is general, and embraces every claſs and deſcription of men, from the higheſt to the loweſt, yet I would wiſh it to be underſtood, on the preſent occaſion, that I am not addreſſing perſons of rank and property, for thoſe who have a large and obvious ſtake in the country are ſufficiently convinced of their danger from the threatened invaſion. It is that deſcription of perſons who are *really the People*, and who conſtitute the great maſs of every ſociety, thoſe who exiſt by their daily labour, whom I would wiſh to convince of the danger that beſets them, and to ſatisfy *them* that *they* have alſo ſomething at *ſtake*, which is of infinitely more value and importance than a little property; that their honour, their liberties, their independence, their wives, their children, their means of exiſtence, and their exiſtence itſelf, is threatened by a cruel and *ſavage* enemy.

I ſhall not appeal to your paſſions, though the indignation of every Engliſhman (a nation famed for humanity and honour) muſt be moſt powerfully excited by the perfidy and the cruelties of the Tyrant of France. There is not an Engliſhman who would not be aſhamed to unite with, or to rank under the banner of the *Murderer* of Jaffa; the man who maſſacres in cold blood priſoners, children, and women; the man who *poiſons his fellow ſoldiers*; the deſolator of Nations; whoſe ſteps are marked

with horror, rapine, and murder, wherever his ferocious and plundering bands have planted his ſtandard.

But it is not to this or any other paſſion I would wiſh to appeal. It is to your *reaſon*, and to your *intereſts*. I would ſhew you, as I think I can, that it is as much *your* intereſt to oppoſe the plunderers and aſſaſſins of BONAPARTE, as that of any man of property among us.

Thoſe who wiſh to betray you will inſinuate "that your lot is poverty; you exiſt by your labour from day to day; that you can but work hard and gain little in whatever hands the Government of this country is veſted." But this is *not true*, for you would find, that if this country were ſubdued by the French, you could not gain *an exiſtence by your labour*, if indeed exiſtence would be allowed you at all.

No man feels more ſincerely for the hardſhips of the poor than the writer of this Addreſs. That they have many to encounter is too true, and ſuch has been the caſe from the beginning of time, and, it is to be feared, ever will. Yet the condition of the poor in this country is infinitely preferable to their condition in any other country in Europe. Though individuals may occaſionally have much to ſuffer, yet there are many alleviations of their hardſhips, and their condition may be bettered by many more circumſtances than are to be found in any other country. This is a great, opulent, and trading nation; every man who is willing to work can find employment, and certain and ready pay. This is not the caſe in any other country in Europe, and particularly in France, where the poor are now literally *ſtarving*, where the *highways are crowded*

crowded with beggars; where, notwithſtanding the thouſands who have been maſſacred, many other thouſands have actually periſhed for want at different times, ſince the commencement of the Revolution.

Should the French ſucceſsfully invade this country, its trade and manufactures muſt be inevitably ruined. That wealth which enables your employers to pay and maintain you will all be plundered, and you will find, too late, that you cannot "work and live;"—that you can neither get employment nor ſubſiſtence.

The condition of the poor, however deplorable it may ſeem, is ſtill better in this country than in any other, in the proſpects which are opened to induſtry and enterprize. It is, perhaps, the only country in Europe where a poor man, by application or invention, can entertain the hope of becoming rich. I could enumerate almoſt thouſands of inſtances, within my own knowledge, where men by diligence or ingenuity have riſen from the very loweſt ſtations to ſit among the Grandees and Legiſlators of their Country. The late moſt ingenious, moſt reſpectable Mr. WEDGWOOD, was a poor boy, and, even in his maturer years, worked as a common journeyman potter. Sir RICHARD ARKWRIGHT was an obſcure country Barber, till his ingenious invention raiſed him to a princely fortune. The ſtory of WHITTINGTON is every day realiſed in this metropolis, by perſons who have not indeed riſen by the caſual aid of a *Cat*, but by ſurer means—by activity and induſtry. A late moſt reſpectable and moſt reſpected Chief Magiſtrate of this City, is not aſhamed to own that he roſe from one of the loweſt ſituations in life, and

that

that the ſtreets which he paraded in ſtate, he had formerly traverſed without ſhoe or ſtocking. Now, ſhew me any thing like this in France! And yet more; if the French were unfortunately ever to come among us, all this would be at an end; the hopes of the poor man would be for ever cruſhed, for our trade would be ruined.

However humanity may be diſpoſed to commiſerate the hardſhips to which many of the poor are expoſed, ſtill, in this happy Country, there are ſome circumſtances that ſerve greatly to alleviate them. That noble, that honourable, and humane inſtitution, the parochial proviſion which is made for them, muſt be a great ſource of comfort to every poor man. It muſt be a conſolation to know, that in old age and infirmity he will not be left to periſh for want in the highway; to know that he has a *right* to a maintenance from his country; that he can *claim*, and need not beg it. This, too, would be all deſtroyed by a ſucceſsful invaſion; and the laſt hope and ſolace of the poor man, would thus be taken from him.

Beſides the parochial proviſion, what country can boaſt ſuch noble inſtitutions for the relief of poverty and diſtreſs as this? In ſickneſs, you are taken care of; there are alms-houſes for old age; and your children are clothed and educated by the ſpirited contributions of your fellow-citizens.—Alas! were theſe deſolators of the earth to come among us, every hoſpital and alms-houſe would be razed to the ground, and that which ſupported them would be the prey of *wolves* and *tigers*.

Under the horrid reign of the Corſican Tyrant, you would not only be *poor*, but you would be *ſlaves*. You would not be *tried* by your *Peers*, your

your *equals*, your fellow-citizens, men of like paſſions and feelings with yourſelves: you would be tried by a military tribunal, or worſe, by his ſordid, venal, cruel judges; for he has an inveterate hatred to the trial by jury. You would not be called upon to ſerve your country as volunteers, or enrolled in a national militia, which even the KING himſelf cannot order on foreign ſervice: You would be dragged in *chains* as *conſcripts*, and tranſported to ſerve as ſomething worſe than ſlaves in St. Domingo, Guiana, Africa, and the moſt unwholeſome climates upon earth.

The condition, too, of a French ſoldier, is the moſt *miſerable* that can be conceived, and their valour is, in moſt caſes, the effect of deſpair in men to whom death is a releaſe. They are allowed not half the pay of an Engliſh ſoldier, and yet this miſerable pittance is always in arrear. They are *ſtarving* and *in rags*, unleſs they have the good luck to be ſent into Holland to be clothed at the expence of that unfortunate people, whom the FIRST CONSUL inſults and derides under the title of Allies.

But, under all theſe horrible and humiliating circumſtances, perhaps a daſtardly conduct will not even ſecure to you the wretched boon of exiſtence. He will not even let you *ſtarve* in quiet. Do you think that he murders only the rich? Alas! it is a truth, that the hardſhips and inſults inflicted on a conquered country by an invading enemy, fall chiefly on the poor. The rich can find means to fly, or have ſomething to offer that may ſave or redeem their perſons. When he deſolated Franconia, Suabia, Piedmont, do you ſuppoſe that he cut off only the opulent? No ſuch thing—it was the harmleſs peaſants, their wives and children, that

that experienced his cruelty. When he ſtormed Alexandria, and maſſacred the wretched inhabitants, who *fled for protection to the houſe of God*, did he make any diſtinction between the rich and the poor? No; man, woman, and child, were indiſcriminately put to the ſword.—When he murdered in cold blood FOUR THOUSAND perſons of all ages and ſexes on the ſand-hills of Jaffa, were theſe all *rich* people? They were the *poor* inhabitants of a *poor* Turkiſh village.—What does the French hiſtorian of their exploits relate of the conduct of BONAPARTE's Army in Egypt? "If the miſerable inhabitants of any village quitted it through terror on the approach of the French, on their return they found nothing but the mud of which the walls were formed," the roofs and all the utenſils being burnt and deſtroyed. "Nothing was found, either of corn or of animals, but the bodies of their faithful dogs, killed in attempting to defend their Maſter's property." If the French made any ſtay in a village, "ſuch of the inhabitants as fled were treated as rebels." When they ſubmitted, and came in a body to pay the heavy contributions, amounting generally to their all, they were often ſhot at by the riflemen (through miſtake, ſo careleſs are the French of human blood), and moſt of them ſlaughtered. "When they ſtaid quietly in their villages," or joined the French, they were only "compelled to ſupply the wants of the army," "ſaw their proviſions eaten with regularity," and "had a *few* of their wives and daughters raviſhed."*

To do the FIRST CONSUL juſtice, his *impartial* cruelty is equally dealt out to both friend and foe. Thoſe

* See DENON's Travels in Egypt, publiſhed under the patronage of the FIRST CONSUL.

Thoſe who have betrayed and deſerted their country, receive in return only inſult and indignity. Aſk the unfortunate Iriſh, many of whom are now ſtarving in the ſtreets of Paris, for their love of French principles, and their admiration of BONAPARTE? The Mutineers of the *Hermione*, however, one would think, by their atrocity and cruelty, would have merited his eſteem; they were "of the ſame kidney" with himſelf: yet what was their reward? Only the miſerable privilege of re-ſhipping themſelves, and coming home to be hanged on gibbets.

My Countrymen, let me intreat you to make uſe of the *native*, *plain*, *good ſenſe* of Engliſhmen. The man who now addreſſes you is *one of yourſelves*. He is neither a perſon of rank nor fortune; he knows that it is impoſſible in any country that *every man can be rich*; but in this country he knows and feels that he enjoys many advantages which he could not have under the preſent *execrable tyranny* exerciſed in France, where people can neither *write* nor *ſpeak their thoughts*, where every ſocial pleaſure is deſtroyed by the ſuſpicions of a jealous and cruel Government, where every thing is decided by the point of the bayonet, and where the miſerable inhabitants exiſt in perpetual fear of their lives.

Your forefathers deteſted the *ſlavery of France*, and boldly reſiſted all their attempts to enſlave their country. If you will enquire and examine into *the truth*, you will find that France now exiſts in a *more abject ſtate of ſlavery* than under the worſt of its Kings. BONAPARTE *hates* you; he may, perhaps, affect to ſmile upon a traitor, but if that traitor is an Engliſhman, "his ſmile is death," as was remarked

marked by one of his own attendants at Jaffa; and let it not be forgotten, that the very General appointed to command the expedition againſt you, has declared, " that, if he comes, he will make England ſuch a country that it will not be fit for Engliſhmen to live in."

Theſe, my friends, are facts, and I am not deluding you by fine words.—And could you, however unpromiſing your preſent condition, bear to ſee that country that gave you birth, that country, the nurſe of liberty, that has produced a race of heroes, the terror of tyrants, who made the proud Louis tremble on his throne—could you bear to ſee that country made a deſart?—Periſh the wretch who ſays, " becauſe we are *poor* we muſt be *rebels!*" Whycannot a poor man have in his heart the ſame ſentiments of honour and of patriotiſm as his richer neighbours? I deteſt the villain that would dare to tell me the contrary; and when the *agents of France* utter ſuch ſentiments, they *inſult* and *mock* us, and would lead us to our ruin. We will, however, teach them a different leſſon. It is only by acting *as men* that we can be reſpected even by an enemy. Cowards and traitors are always deſpiſed; but Engliſhmen, thank God! are neither: they will be found to reſiſt *tyranny* in every form, and be the tyrant whom he may. They will ſhew their enemies that *virtue* and *valour*, and *honour* and *patriotiſm*, are the lot not merely of the rich, but of the poor; and that to be *rich* in theſe qualities, is to be really greater than the poſſeſſor of millions. I am, my dear Countrymen, Your real friend,

London, Aug. 3d. VALERIUS.

LET-

LETTER VIII.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

In offering a few obſervations on the letter of a *True Engliſhman*, which appeared in your Paper of Saturday, it is far from my intention to provoke any diſcuſſion, that may tend to diſturb that unanimity ſo neceſſary at preſent; that unanimity which reflects ſo much credit on the good ſenſe, diſcernment, and patriotiſm of the Nation at this criſis. It is, indeed, my wiſh to promote the general harmony, by removing miſconception; and to cheriſh the general ſpirit of patriotiſm, by deprecating that leſſer ſpecies of faction, which might reſult from any invidious diſtinction between the different claſſes of loyal ſubjects, and particularly between the landed and trading intereſts, ſo intimately connected as they ought to be, and dependant, as they naturally are, upon each other.

The Fund at Lloyd's has always had my warmeſt approbation. It is a grand deſign, and will remain upon record as a moſt ſtriking monument of Britiſh ſpirit, Britiſh generoſity, and Britiſh benevolence, in the commencement of the nineteenth century. It deſerves the praiſe of the preſent generation, and will command the admiration of poſterity. You, Sir, I obſerved, were the firſt to announce it; and you did it with the warm commendation it deſerved: I therefore conclude that no

* Written in anſwer to a Letter ſigned "A True Engliſhman," upbraiding the Nobility and Gentry for not having contributed more largely to the Fund at Lloyd's.

no writer in your Paper would wiſh to depreciate it, or to impede in any manner its ſucceſs.

But while I give every credit and praiſe which is due to the authors and promoters of this truly ſpirited inſtitution (for ſuch I may venture to call it), ſtill I think it uncandid to ſtigmatiſe, without knowing his motives, every man who does not appear as an immediate ſubſcriber. While we are juſt to one party, let us not be unjuſt towards another. Men may entertain very different views of their duty, and yet be equally animated by the ſame laudable emotions. One man conceives he is moſt eſſentially ſerving his country, by rewarding the families of thoſe who fall in its cauſe; and another, in providing for its immediate defence. The Marquis of BUCKINGHAM, it is true, would have diſpoſed of his princely donation extremely well, had he beſtowed it on the Fund at Lloyd's; but he thought, and many will think with him, that he has made a diſpoſition of it equally good, in contributing to the raiſing of Volunteers. I glory, Sir, in the ſpirit which my country has manifeſted on this trying occaſion; and I ſhould think myſelf guilty of great injuſtice, if I taxed any claſs or body of men with being deficient in patriotiſm at this moment. I do not ſee any ſuch deficiency. I ſee all men, of all ranks and orders, vying with each other in their active exertions, from the boatmen on the Thames, to the Nobles and Princes of the land. To the *individual*, who has the ability and not the will to make any exertion at all, I hope that contempt will attach which is juſtly due to all ſuch *minor traitors*, for ſuch they are; but really, before I can conſent to brand with cenſure any reſpectable body of men, I muſt ſee much ſtronger proofs

proofs than any the *True Engliſhman* has adduced.

I am willing to believe that the *haſty zeal* of your Correſpondent has not permitted him to make the neceſſary enquiry before he wrote upon the ſubject; had he given himſelf proper time, and ſought for proper information, he would, I am perſuaded, have been more candid. The efforts of the Nobility and Gentry are not confined to the munificence of the Nobleman I have juſt mentioned; to the ſpirited exertions of the Dukes of NORTHUMBERLAND and BEDFORD; to the very fine Corps of Cavalry enrolled under Mr. VILLIERS; look at every part of the Country, and you will ſee the ſame effects, though on a leſſer ſcale. You will ſee Corps of both Infantry and Cavalry ſtarting up daily into exiſtence, under the auſpices of men of rank and fortune, and at a great expence to thoſe Gentlemen; and theſe entirely independent of the parochial enrolment. It would ſerve to appal the enemy, and to cheer the ſpirits of the Country, if you, Sir, could *procure a liſt of theſe different Corps of Volunteers:* and indeed, I hope, after what has been ſaid, that the Gentlemen concerned in raiſing them will, by giving you the neceſſary information, enable you to preſent us with the encouraging catalogue. I know of many ſuch myſelf; but, fearful of inaccuracy, I am unwilling to enter on the detail; hoping that it will be done by ſome perſon or perſons more adequate to the taſk.

With reſpect even to the contributions to the Patriotic Fund, I am perſuaded your Correſpondent is much too haſty in his concluſions. The landed Gentry had ſcarcely returned to their coun-

try reſidences, when they called their friends and their neighbours together; and ſeveral county ſubſcriptions are already commenced.

Before I conclude, Sir, permit me to correct one eſſential and obvious miſtake of your Correſpondent: he has ſaid, "that the ſtake which men of Landed Property, and thoſe dependent on our eſtabliſhments, hold in the country, is much deeper" than that of Commercial Men, and thoſe poſſeſſed of Perſonal Property; and he would infer, that the former have a ſtronger intereſt in the Defence of the Country. This, Sir, I altogether deny. In a former letter I have deprecated the *miſerable and abſurd idea that this is a war for Property.* We are all equally intereſted in the defence of the Country, the poor as well as the rich; for the *poor man's all is as dear to him as the abundance of his richer neighbour.* But really, Sir, if there is to be any diſtinction made, I muſt ſay, that the property of the Commercial and Monied Intereſt is *in much greater danger from a French invaſion than that of the Landed Gentry*; and for this plain reaſon, that theirs is a much more periſhable commodity. Even an unſucceſsful invaſion would ſhake the foundations of ſome of that property, while the land would remain where it is. Without wiſhing to depreciate in the leaſt the commercial part of the community, for they are an honour to Britain—and I honour their liberality upon every occaſion—I honour the talents of many among them; yet I may be permitted to obſerve, that it is neither the *ſkill* nor the *induſtry* of our great Manufacturers and Traders that produces their *profits*; it is their *capital.* Deſtroy that, and they are, as Traders and Manufacturers, effectually deſtroyed; and,

and, in many inſtances, I will venture to ſay, capital would be deſtroyed or eſſentially injured by even an unſucceſsful invaſion. I would not have mentioned this ſubject, Sir, had it not been pointedly called for by the obſervation of your Correſpondent. I wiſh not to create invidious diſtinctions; I wiſh not to excite any groundleſs jealouſies amongſt ourſelves. It is the object of this letter to put them all to ſleep. We have ALL, as I before obſerved, even the pooreſt amongſt us, ſufficient cauſe to love our Country; we have ALL ſufficient motives to defend it. Let us, therefore, avoid every cauſe of diſſention; let us not complain of a deficiency of patriotiſm, when every corner of the kingdom furniſhes us with the moſt deciſive and ſatisfactory proofs that the ſpirit and loyalty of the Nation have ſcarcely ever been wound up to ſo high a pitch. Let us not, by injurious imputations, wound the feelings of any reſpectable claſs of our fellow-ſubjects; at leaſt, before we venture to advance ſuch imputations, let us be certain to advance them on ſufficient proof.

Auguſt 22. VALERIUS.

If any man but ſeriouſly conſiders the dreadful conſequences which enſued from the clamour raiſed againſt the *Ariſtocracy in France*, he will be extremely cautious of countenancing any ſuch clamour in this Country. Doubtleſs, many of thoſe who unfortunately joined in exclaiming againſt the Nobleſſe in the firſt ſtages of the French Revolution, did not foreſee the lamentable effects which were to ſucceed.

LETTER IX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

IN the courſe of my correſpondence with you, I have regarded the public advantage more than any perſonal conſideration; and I would much rather be eſteemed an uſeful, than a brilliant writer. The ſubject on which I now addreſs you is, I think, of equal importance with any that has lately engaged the public attention: but I do not wiſh it to be treated as a party queſtion; and as far as *I* am concerned, to view it in ſuch a light will be unjuſt.

It is the glorious privilege of our happy Conſtitution, that the characters and conduct of all public men may be freely diſcuſſed; but it is in the nature of all privileges that they are liable to abuſe. To cenſure Miniſters is often ſalutary, I might ſay neceſſary to the public proſperity; but that cenſure ought to be in ſeaſon. There are times when even palpable errors ought to be overlooked, rather than unſettle or diſtract the Government; but at ſuch times to bring forward charges which cannot be proved, or, what is worſe, to advance inſinuations which admit of no inveſtigation, is the act, not of a patriot, but of a *traitor*. I have made uſe, Sir, of a ſtrong phraſe; but really at ſuch a criſis as the preſent, to diſſeminate doubts and fears of the capacity of Miniſters to ſave the country, eſpecially if theſe doubts be without argument or proof to ſupport them, is little ſhort of treaſon. It

is

is to give ſpirit and vigour to the enemy; to encourage him in all his deſperate deſigns; it is to propagate deſpondency among ourſelves, when we are told that our ſafety is entruſted to hands which are incapable of eſtabliſhing it; it is the worſt effort of Jacobin malignity; and whoever will attentively read the *laſt* pages that record the annals of the French Monarchy, will find, that it was by ſuch artifices as theſe, that the execrable faction to which I allude effected its downfall. They infuſed doubts into the public mind, to the diſadvantage of every adminiſtration of whom the unfortunate monarch made choice; they rendered the ſituation of miniſters irkſome and uncomfortable. Thus the enemy without was encouraged to advance, and the ſeditious within accompliſhed that fatal blow, by which all regular Government was at once annihilated, and the moſt hideous and bloody anarchy eſtabliſhed in its place.

The inſinuations to which I refer are the more wicked and malignant, becauſe they are *only inſinuations*. Direct charges may be fairly met and diſproved if they be falſe; but ſuch inuendoes make an impreſſion, becauſe they admit not of proof; and though facts may be againſt them in every inſtance alledged, ſtill the aſſertion is of a metaphyſical nature, and becauſe it cannot be embodied, it is impoſſible to encounter it.

I am ſurpriſed to obſerve, that theſe inſinuations proceed almoſt excluſively from the remnants of the Old Oppoſition. What theſe men would be at I can ſcarcely conjecture, unleſs it be the deſtruction, not only of the Miniſtry, but of the Monarchy itſelf. Do they wiſh once more to ſee the *houſe* of GRENVILLE in the plenitude of power?

For *their ſakes* I could almoſt wiſh it; I could almoſt adviſe the Miniſter to a coalition with that ambitious family. The party whoſe mean and illiberal attacks I am now oppoſing, would ſoon find the difference; they would lament a meaſure, which their conduct at preſent is only calculated to promote; they would lament it in ſackcloth and aſhes.

If his MAJESTY's preſent ſervants were diſmiſſed, there are only two parties to whom he could have recourſe to form an Adminiſtration, Mr. FOX and his party; or Mr. PITT and the GRENVILLES. To promote the views of the firſt of theſe parties is undoubtedly the object of the writers to whom I am now replying: but are theſe writers ſo deſtitute of information, ſo devoid of all common powers of reflection, as to indulge for a moment the fond and deluſive hope of ſeeing Mr. FOX once more the Miniſter of this Country? I have no perſonal objection to Mr. FOX, and I am very far from wiſhing to wound his feelings; but I could ſtate reaſons which would prove to demonſtration that he never can be in that ſituation. If *every other obſtacle* were removed, there is a ſtrong, an active, an opulent, a moſt powerful party in the Nation, whoſe prejudices are not to be overcome, and who would not reſt till he were again diſplaced. I reſpect the abilities of Mr. FOX as highly as any man; but I recollect, that even during his *ſhort* adminiſtration charges of *inconſiſtency* were brought, and of much greater magnitude than any that have been advanced againſt the preſent Miniſtry. I recollect it being alledged that Mr. FOX, before his entrance into office, boaſted "of having a peace in his pocket," and yet conſuming the whole period

riod of his firſt Adminiſtration in carrying on the war, which was only terminated by his ſucceſſor. I recollect his declarations, his threats againſt Lord NORTH; and I recollect his coalition with that nobleman. I recollect taxes which he had condemned being afterwards adopted. Thoſe who inſpect the debates of Parliament, will find much more to recollect. But I will only aſk, has Mr. ADDINGTON yet been guilty of inconſiſtencies like theſe?

The other party is Mr. PITT and the GRENVILLES; but will the *Old Oppoſition* tell us, that *conſiſtency* is to be expected from them? The debates of Parliament during the late adminiſtration, are little elſe than a collection of charges of *inconſiſtency* brought by the Oppoſition againſt the Miniſtry. "They never acted on any principle or ſyſtem," —"They had no fixed plan whatever,"—"They were a Miniſtry of expedients,"—"They exiſted by exciting alarms;" and the name of "exiſting circumſtances" was appropriated to Mr. PITT, as characteriſtic of his Adminiſtration. The war itſelf was (according to theſe Gentlemen) a tiſſue of inconſiſtencies. "It was commenced for one object, and was carried on for another." At one time it was laid to the aggreſſion of France; afterwards (when France appeared willing to ſubmit to terms, and an overture was made by LE BRUN,) it became a war for "religion and ſocial order." At one time it was to obtain "indemnity for the paſt and ſecurity for the future;" at another, "it was to ſeat the Houſe of Bourbon on the Throne." Such were the arguments of Oppoſition againſt a Miniſtry whom they now affect *faintly* to extol. A writer in their intereſt, and who may be ſup-

poſed to ſpeak the ſenſe of the party, characterizes Mr. PITT's Miniſtry as a "temporiſing *make-ſhift* Adminiſtration, which purſued no meaſures whatever with conſiſtency;" and he adds, as a proof, "that it is a well-known fact, that a meaſure of the higheſt national importance, which had been ordered in the afternoon, has been revoked the ſucceeding morning." Nay, the ſtyle of the party is not yet altered in this particular inſtance; for, in the only paper which appears at preſent to be excluſively in the intereſt of the Old Oppoſition, I find, yeſterday morning, the following paragraph:—"With all the *pretenſions* to vigour and energy which the late Miniſters laid claim to, their military plans in Europe evinced every feature of *imbecility*. In hardly one inſtance were the means proportioned to the end. Succeſs might attend them; but this was a ſucceſs attributable to *chance*, and not to be aſcribed to *foreſight*. The proviſions made to enſure ſucceſs were *not ſuch as wiſe men* were entitled to calculate upon, according to any of the principles which govern human affairs. The expedition to Egypt itſelf is no exception to this general aſſertion. Every military man now knows that the number of troops ſent out under the command of the gallant General ABERCROMBIE, was far from being adequate to the hazardous nature of the enterprize. It is not, it cannot now be attempted to be denied, that Miniſters were *ſhamefully ignorant* of the numbers and ſituation of the French troops in Egypt. They ſent out an army not deſigned to expel the French troops from that country, after a long and ſevere campaign, and by the loſs of many of our beſt troops, and the death of one of our braveſt and moſt experienced Generals. They

ſent

ſent out this army to receive the emaciated remains of a ruined force, to accept the ſurrender of a few thouſand men, only waiting for an opportunity to lay down their arms to the firſt enemy that ſummoned them. The gallantry of the troops, and the diſunion that prevailed among the French Generals, inſured ſucceſs to the enterprize; but it is monſtrous and unjuſt to aſcribe the honour of a conqueſt to thoſe men, whoſe *ignorance* might have devoted to deſtruction one of the fineſt armies which ever embarked on a foreign expedition. From the knowledge of the diſaſters which attended the military plans of the *late Miniſters*, the public have a right to expect of the preſent Servants of the Crown, that they will avoid the *errors* which marked the conduct of thoſe who preceded them." It is unneceſſary to repeat the charges of *inconſiſtency* and changeable conduct which were alledged by the ſame Gentlemen againſt the late Miniſtry with reſpect to their negociations. The pacific overture of LE BRUN was haughtily rejected; and yet they condeſcended to diſpatch Lord MALMESBURY to Paris to ſolicit a peace. A negociation was carried on at Liſle, much to the humiliation of Great Britain; and yet the letter of the FIRST CONSUL, ſoliciting the reſtoration of peace, was treated with unexampled contumely. It is unneceſſary to repeat what has been ſo often urged on the breach of the treaty of El Ariſch. In the ſame way, with reſpect to foreign alliances, at one time it was, *pay all*, *ſubſidize all*; at another, it was better to ſtand alone. Such are the charges brought by the Old Oppoſition againſt the late adminiſtration; now, Sir, let us hear what they have to alledge on this ground againſt the preſent.

The

The only facts which carry with them any thing like inconſiſtency in Mr. ADDINGTON's conduct, *are two!* In the courſe of *two* years, he has, in *two* inſtances, incurred a charge to which his predeceſſors had almoſt daily been expoſed. The firſt of theſe reflects the higheſt honour on his candour and humanity; on the ſuggeſtion (not of Mr. PITT alone, for that has been ſufficiently refuted, but) of many of the County Members, and other reſpectable ſupporters of Government, he made an alteration in his Property Bill, an exemption in favour of ſmall funded and landed proprietors, an exemption in favour of the widow and the orphan! The Public loſt by the clauſe; but the Miniſter gained the applauſe of the poor, and the prayers of the diſtreſſed. What would have been ſaid, if he had remained inflexible on ſuch a ſubject?—The other charge relates to the change of ſyſtem with reſpect to the Volunteer Corps; but this charge is at preſent prematurely urged. When we hear the reaſons of Government for adopting this meaſure, it will be time enough to diſcuſs it. For my own part, from their paſt conduct, I feel a confidence in the wiſdom and moderation of Government. I believe they would not reject what was eſſential to our ſecurity; nor diſguſt any part of the nation, unleſs compelled by the ſtrongeſt neceſſity!

But "Mr. ADDINGTON acts upon the ſyſtem and principles of no one of the great parties which divide this nation. On one occaſion he concurs with Mr. PITT, and on another with Mr. FOX," and therefore it is moſt *curiouſly* inferred that "he has no opinion of his own!!!" *Riſum teneatis?* If I were aſked for a direct proof that a man acts from

from himself, and is under no tutorage whatever, this would be the very proof that I would adduce; that he squares and fashions his conduct by the opinions of no one man, of no one party, but is sometimes approved by the one, and sometimes by the other. I may add, that in all he has the approbation of the public. Long may he enjoy, long may he deserve it!

The wisdom, firmness, and vigour, of Ministry, are amply shewn in the history of the last Session of Parliament. I most firmly believe that no other set of men in this kingdom would have *dared*, no other set of men could have *carried*, a series of such important, such *gigantic* measures, as they were very properly termed. In that *short* period we have seen the public revenue reformed and improved to the extent of several millions. We have seen a war, formidable above other wars, commenced and carried on with a permanent burthen upon the people of only *ten millions*. We have seen the army and navy recruited in a short space of time, and to a greater extent than ever was known at the commencement of a war; we have seen the whole militia force of the kingdom called out, to the amount of 100,000 men; we have seen an additional regular army of 50,000 created as if by magic; and the whole mass of the people regularly embodied for the defence of the country. Yet this is the Administration which is deficient in energy and spirit!!!

The unqualified approbation bestowed on the talents of Mr. Addington, by so able a judge as Mr. Pitt, in the Debates of the 11th and 16th of February, 1801; the commendation which he has since bestowed upon the conduct and abilities of the

the Miniſters; and the warm and generous praiſe of Mr. SHERIDAN; might be juſtly conſidered as an adequate counterpoiſe to the petty inſinuations of anonymous ſcribblers. But I aſk for no credit to Miniſters upon ſuch grounds. Let them not be prejudged; and let them be judged by their conduct. To this they will, I dare believe, be content to appeal; and by this, and this alone, let them ſtand approved or condemned.

London, Sept. 8. VALERIUS.

LET-

LETTER X.

To the VOLUNTEER ARMY of ENGLAND.

GENTLEMEN,

IT is probable that your generous intention of repelling from your ſhores a moſt deſperate and determined enemy will ſoon be called into action. On ſuch a ſubject, I would addreſs my Countrymen with the firmneſs and temper I wiſh them to poſſeſs on ſo trying an occaſion. I have no fears for the iſſue of the conteſt, if it be managed with wiſdom, as well as with the valour which I know Engliſhmen to poſſeſs. A moſt eſſential point is not only to make external preparations, but to prepare our *minds* for the conflict. As the danger approaches, it is incumbent upon us to conſider the *nature* of the enemy with whom we have to contend; and as it falls to my lot to know ſomething more of his character than moſt of you have had an opportunity of knowing, I flatter myſelf that a few obſervations to that effect will not be regarded as unſeaſonable.

Without wiſhing to uſe opprobrious language, I feel myſelf under an obligation to ſpeak the truth. That truth is, that BONAPARTE has completely ſucceeded in *demoralizing* the French people, and the ſoldiery more eſpecially. He has ſucceeded in rendering them proper inſtruments for all his moſt wicked deſigns. In the majority of the French ſoldiery every feeling of humanity is extinct. The circumſtances of the Revolution have all ſtrongly contributed to this effect. The youth

youth of the nation, ſince the fatal year 1790, have been without education; religion has been diſcarded; every ſpecies of licentiouſneſs encouraged; and they have been eye-witneſſes to ſcenes of horror and atrocity that muſt harden every heart, and extinguiſh every virtuous ſentiment.

Inured to extreme hardſhips, during the war, half ſtarved and ill clothed, yet indulged in rapine and licentiouſneſs, the ſoldiery thirſt for blood and plunder. Any change of ſituation whatever is bettering their condition in ſome degree; at the ſame time that they have acquired a taſte for licentious and depraved pleaſures. They are, therefore, as to every moral principle, a horde of banditti, and fit for every deſperate enterprize. We muſt alſo take into our account (and it would be a fatal deception to think otherwiſe), that they are brave, and will fight with the ferocity of the ſavage animals they reſemble.

The lateſt and moſt authentic accounts from France ſtrongly confirm this ſtatement. The French ſoldiers are impatient, almoſt beyond controul, for the deſcent upon England; they are wound up juſt to the point the First Consul could wiſh; they are *confident of ſucceſs*; and have the inſolence to pronounce, that if they could but effect a landing, the whole power of England could not impede their progreſs. It is believed now by the moſt ſenſible perſons in France, that were the First Consul ever ſo much diſpoſed to alter his mind, the violence of the army would not permit him to retract.

In what manner, therefore, is ſuch an enemy to be received? With *cool and determined courage*. Their *confidence, impetuoſity, and impatience,*

tience, may be turned to the beſt account, if they are only met with firmneſs and deciſion. BONAPARTE has taken every means to intimidate our countrymen. He counts much upon the rawneſs and inexperience of our troops. It is ludicrous to relate one of his expedients. He has really tried to make his men as *frightful* as poſſible. He has tricked them out with immenſe whiſkers and griſley beards!!! as if Engliſhmen were women and children, to be terrified with a *vizor*.

Expect, therefore, Countrymen, to meet a deſperate banditti, accoutred in all the garb and circumſtance of horror. But remember, they are *men*—Frenchmen, of whom the Engliſh people never yet was afraid. They can beat them at *ſea* —even if they are three to one. I cannot, therefore, admit the baſe, the diſgraceful thought, that you will be backward to meet them *man* to *man* on ſhore, or that Engliſh ſoldiers will prove cowards, while Engliſh ſeamen are the admiration of the world. It was never, I believe, yet heard of, that, equally circumſtanced, any number of Engliſhmen fled before an equal number of Frenchmen. Your Countrymen did not fly at Valenciennes, they did not fly at Acre, at Alexandria. Be then the ſame men that your anceſtors were at Blenheim, Malplaquet, Ramilies, and Quebec.

Above all things remember, that if they grapple with you at cloſe quarters, *flight is certain deſtruction*. If your General, for good reaſons, ſounds a retreat, and that can be made in order (without which no Britiſh General would iſſue ſuch a command), it is your duty to obey. But if the French once *cloſe upon you with the bayonet*, determine to maintain your poſt, to conquer or

die.

die. Individually expect no quarter; for I am much miſtaken if you will find it. You are, in general, more able-bodied and ſtronger men than your antagoniſts, and, therefore, in a conteſt with the bayonet, you muſt have the ſuperiority. The charge will, however, be impetuous on the part of the enemy. I warn you to expect it; and unleſs you enter the field with a determination not to give way, you had better not enter it at all.

If, on the contrary, you demean yourſelves like Engliſhmen, you may, under Providence, be confident of victory. You will find your outrageous foe yield to your determined bravery. The conteſt will ſoon be ſettled. The ardour of Frenchmen is eaſily checked; and, after a few diſaſters, they will feel but little induced to encounter you again.

I will add, you muſt not forget that the *enemy is ſkilled in every manœuvre of modern war.* Conſummate caution, therefore, not leſs than courage, will be neceſſary; and while I recommend to you coolneſs and firmneſs, it muſt be ſhewn not leſs in the beginning, than in the whole courſe of the conteſt. To ſay the truth, I am more afraid of your impetuoſity, and impatience to encounter your enemy, than I am of any deficiency in ſpirit. It is the rock on which young and brave troops too commonly meet their deſtruction. You muſt, therefore, put on a firm reſolution to *attend* ſtrictly to the orders of your Commanders, neither to go beyond them on the one hand, nor to be wanting in fulfilling your duty on the other.

October 20. VALERIUS.

LET-

LETTER XI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,

AT a criſis like the preſent, when unanimity is ſo eſſential to the intereſts, perhaps to the exiſtence, of the nation, I ſhould conſider it as wicked to fan the dying embers of party ſpirit, or to revive thoſe political diſſentions which had nearly proved fatal to our country. It is in the hope of compoſing, and not with a deſire of exciting differences, that I venture to addreſs you. I wiſh to offend neither any man nor any party; I wiſh only that my countrymen ſhould think with ſome degree of liberality upon public affairs; and I would claim for Miniſters that juſtice only, which, to other men, it would be a crime to refuſe. It is common, I believe, to conſider Miniſters as fair game, and to load them with abuſe, whether they deſerve it or not; but ſurely this is not acting upon the ſyſtem of Britiſh juriſprudence. It may ſuit the regime of BONAPARTE or ROBESPIERRE, to condemn without a trial; but in England, to arraign upon general charges, without any reference to facts, is not cenſure, but *defamation*.

If, Sir, I might be permitted to criticiſe, in one inſtance, the conduct of your paper, I would ſay, that in calling certain Journaliſts the *ci-devant Jacobins*, you have been guilty of a miſnomer. I confeſs, I ſee nothing like repentance, and much leſs reformation, in theſe Editors. They dare not, in oppoſition to the public opinion, praiſe the

First Consul of France, or defend openly his meaſures; but they are ſtill, upon true Jacobin principles, endeavouring to render the people diſcontented with their Government—diſſeminating a diſtruſt of the Miniſters of the Crown; and that with an unbluſhing front of falſehood, calculated to impoſe on the weak and ill-informed, and with a malignant ſubtlety which eludes refutation, by advancing only a general charge.

It may afford ſome conſolation to the friends of the preſent Miniſtry, to hear their talents and virtues ſtill rated above thoſe of their predeceſſors.—"Thoſe (ſay theſe Gentlemen) who are the loudeſt in condemning Mr. Addington, would have us once more take refuge in the Adminiſtration of Mr. Pitt. They bid us look for unity of counſel in the men who ſent Lord Fitzwilliam to Ireland with full powers, and almoſt for the ſole purpoſe of emancipating the Catholics, and diſgraced him in three months for obeying their own commands—thoſe are held up as models of deciſive conduct and conſiſtent principle, who, in a war, undertaken to reſtore the Bourbons, took *Valenciennes* for the Emperor, *Dunkirk* for the King of England, and *Toulon* for the King of the French, and the Conſtitution of 1789. We are to expect vigour and felicity in the conduct of a war, from the projectors of the invaſion of *Holland*, and the expedition to *St. Domingo*; from the heroes of *Quiberon*, *Ferrol*, and of *Cadiz*. We are to be led to glory and ſucceſs by the very men whoſe ſhameful miſmanagement of the laſt war made it neceſſary to acquieſce in a degrading peace. We are to place implicit confidence in the prudence and diſcretion of thoſe, whoſe arrogant refuſal to negotiate, when

when we might have done ſo with honour, reduced us," &c.*

Thus, Sir, theſe ſelf-elected umpires of political talent, will neither have Mr. PITT nor Mr. ADDINGTON for a Miniſter. Let them, then, boldly ſtand forth, and let them *name* the men who are to ſuperſede the preſent Miniſters; let them bring forward thoſe incomparable Stateſmen who are neither weak nor corrupt; thoſe ſteady conſiſtent politicians, who never ſwerved from their profeſſions, who never deviated into error. Whether they ſummon theſe *choice ſpirits* from BROOKES's or from ARTHUR's, from the Whig Club, the Scotch Convention, or the Correſponding Society, let them be no longer *aſhamed to name them.* Whatever they are, their merits ſhall be canvaſſed; and I will promiſe not to imitate the diſingenuouſneſs of my antagoniſts; I will arraign them, if they are to be arraigned, not by epithets, but by facts.

London, Nov. 1. VALERIUS.

P. S. Whoever will attend to the inſidious detraction of the Volunteer Corps in the Paper alluded to of Monday, under the guiſe of commendation, will ſee that the *ſpirit* of Jacobiniſm continues the ſame, whatever maſk it may be convenient to wear for the preſent. This is literally to

" Damn with faint praiſe, aſſent with civil leer,
" Himſelf not ſneering, others teach to ſneer."

The open abuſe of COBBETT is more honeſt, and leſs miſchievous. The generous applauſe of their SOVEREIGN, conveyed in ſuch handſome and forcible terms; the approbation of ſo many diſtinguiſhed and veteran Commanders, will, however, amply counter-balance ſuch unworthy attacks.

* Morning Chronicle, October 21.

LETTER XII.

To the Right Hon. WILLIAM WINDHAM,
EX-MINISTER AT WAR.

SIR,

IF we inſpect the writings of a perſon for whom you have avowed your partiality, and if we conſider the ſhare and intereſt which you are reported to have taken in the publications of that perſon, it is only fair to conclude, that you are no enemy to notoriety, and that you eſteem it no intolerable grievance to ſee your name occaſionally grace the columns of a Newſpaper. Your virtues were not intended to wither in the ſhade; and there are men who ſuſpect, that even the eccentricities which diſtinguiſh your Parliamentary harangues, are deſigned purpoſely to attract the notice of the public; and that, like ſome other perſons equally *well-intentioned*, you would rather be remarkable for any thing, than not remarkable at all. In this reſpect, Sir, I have little doubt but you will be amply gratified. I will be candid enough to confeſs, that I have myſelf long ſince marked you out, as one who is in every reſpect deſerving of my attention; and that I ſhall obſerve you with the ſame anxious curioſity that I ſhould regard one of thoſe beacons, or ſignal poſts, that are erected to give us notice of the motions of the enemy.

You are not, Sir, to conſider theſe expreſſions as founded in diſreſpect; I mean them as a compliment to your ſincerity. In ſome of the party with whom you have thought proper to connect

nect yourself, there is a degree of political caution, of French *finesse*, which leaves us in the dark with respect to their motives and designs. You, Sir, are composed of better materials; you are of plain English stuff. Your generous intemperance was destined by Providence to save your country, since it prompts you to disclose, prematurely, the machinations of a party who might otherwise effect its ruin. It is, indeed, in this view, that I regard you as a person of importance; and, much as I may privately respect the talents of Mr. WINDHAM, I should certainly not deem it right to occupy the time and attention of the public on the sentiments of an individual, did I not conceive that, in your declamation of Wednesday, you were uttering the sentiments of a party.

It was, I confess, matter of great surprise to me to learn, that you were in the House on the opening of the session, and that you omitted the opportunity of mingling in the debate. My surprise was augmented, when I found also, that *your old Monitor*, he who, by his significant gestures, was accustomed to restrain your excesses, or to compel you to a reluctant silence, was absent. Under what vow, under what solemn engagement to your allies, was it, Sir, that on such an occasion you possessed the gift of *continence* in almost a miraculous degree? There is, doubtless, some mystery in the matter (for your party, notwithstanding their connection with you, were always dealers in mystery), which time only can unravel. On the following day, however, it seems, you considered yourself as absolved from these Eleusinian rites *(insanis legibus solutus)*; and, to use a vulgar expression, you were *your own man again*. You discharged your

pop-gun at Miniſtry; you emptied it of its contents, and were conſequently relieved. I am told that your party ſtood ſtupified with wonder, when they obſerved you riſe from your ſeat. By the oppoſite party your harangue was received with the moſt perfect indifference; not one conſidered it as worthy of a reply. The queſtion was put with the uſual *ſang froid*, and the Houſe ſeparated as if nothing had happened.

But all this I grant, Sir, is foreign to the purpoſe; what is it to us, or to the Public, whether you were anſwered or not; or whether you were noticed or not? I have already declared that I was not now prompted to addreſs you as the individual Mr. WINDHAM—the Mr. WINDHAM, whom I have heard load Mr. PITT and the GRENVILLES with every opprobrious epithet, as men of the moſt *contemptible talents* and *attainments**; as the *fag-ends* of the two great parties of the Nation; as men who by chicanery and *back-ſtairs trick*, ſtole into offices for which they were *utterly incompetent*, to the excluſion of all the great and venerable ſtateſmen of the age—the Mr. WINDHAM, whom I ſaw deſert thoſe great and venerable ſtateſmen, and join the Miniſters whom he had before repreſented as almoſt unfit for an office in his MAJESTY'S ſtables. It is not as Mr. WINDHAM that I wiſh to notice you at preſent: it is as the organ and repreſentative of the only party which at preſent may be called an Oppoſition.

You commence, Sir, with a moſt curious diſtinction, one which requires a little previous acquaintance with your ſtyle of oratory to comprehend;

* I ſhall one day turn over the Parliamentary Debates for ſome years back, in order to exhibit a ſpecimen of the conſiſtency of modern Stateſmen.

hend; a distinction between approving his Majesty's Government and his Majesty's Ministers. But we will not now enter upon a discussion which might a little embarrass even your ingenuity. I am content to understand you in your own sense, which is undoubtedly this: "When I am utterly unable to point out any error in the conduct of his Majesty's Government, then I frankly and honestly confess, that it is only to his Majesty's Ministers *personally* that I have an objection: and yet not *personally* neither—*for I have no right to speak disparagingly of their general abilities. I have no right to say, there are no talents among the Gentlemen opposite. I have no right to say, they are not men of cultivated understandings, of liberal education, of very good natural endowments, or to say they are not read in the history of their country.* But, in five words, Sir, I am out of place."

In doing justice to the character of Ministers, Sir, you have acted like a man of a liberal and enlightened mind, who will not condescend to the meanness of unsubstantiated accusation, or of unmeaning womanish abuse. The Ministers and their friends cannot wish a higher character than that you have bestowed upon them. You have allowed them to be *men of talents*, men of *cultivated understandings*, of very *good natural endowments*, men who are *well read in the history of their country*. I think, and I have always thought the same; and I now assert, that in their conduct during the late negociation, and in the wise and spirited measures which they have since adopted for the defence of the country, they have evinced that they amply merit your eulogium on their "general talents." But, Sir, how are we to reconcile these

terms of "general" commendation with your assertion, that they are men unfit to be trusted with the government of this country, and your apprehensions that their administration may survive the country itself? To have made this assertion, without assigning a *reason* or a *proof*, would have been to incur the censure from which I have already absolved you—that of low and unmeaning slander and abuse. The *Jacobin* Journal, (with great consistency I admit), represents you as making the assertion without the shadow of a proof. Other Papers, evidently better informed, report your speech as referring to the Peace of Amiens, by which you assert that Ministers "signed the death-warrant of the country." I have not now time, Sir, to discuss the Treaty of Amiens; nor can it be necessary to investigate again a measure which has been solemnly sanctioned by the King, Lords, and Commons, in Parliament; which was universally called for by the voice of the nation; and which was the subject of general approbation and joy. That it was not a lasting Treaty, was not the fault of the British Ministry; but that it has been productive of any evil to the country, I am utterly unable to discover—that it has wasted our strength, impoverished our resources, or destroyed our unanimity.

When you come to bring your threatened accusation against Ministers, remember, Sir, that we shall expect something more than vague declamation and unmeaning epithets, such as may pass in COBBETT, and Lord TEMPLE, and the Jacobin prints. We shall expect *facts*, and *proofs of facts*. In the mean time, will you presume to say that the Ministry have done nothing? Can you look at the present state of the country, and dare to make such an

an aſſertion? The Miniſtry, it is true, have not to boaſt of "negative ſucceſſes;" they have not to boaſt of the Netherlands abandoned, of Holland drenched with Britiſh blood, of the maſſacre of Quiberon, of St. Domingo fattened with the carcaſſes of 30,000 Britons.—If theſe are "the energetic exertions," this the "efficient activity" which you call for, miniſters have no ſuch to boaſt. They lay not their claim to public approbation on "energetic exertions" made without counſel, reflection, or found political information of the ſtate and the deſigns of the enemy; on meaſures of violence where it was not called for, and of torpidity where action would have been uſeful; on a peurile and ſanguine zeal, which never calculates or computes, which never proportions the means to the end, nor conſiders whether the end be attainable or not. They have to boaſt that they have rouſed and called forth, by ſober and rational councils, all the great energies of this great empire; that in the ſhort ſpace of *five months*, they have made ſuch preparations as can put to ſcorn the menaces of an enemy who has trampled on the reſt of Europe; that the commerce of that enemy is already deſtroyed, his country ruined, and his foreign poſſeſſions falling one after another into our hands. This has been effected without a profuſion of treaſure and of blood; and from this glorious beginning, I aſſert, that we are warranted in our expectations, that neither the property of the public will be *laviſhly ſquandered*, by a *prodigal* Government, nor the lives of Engliſhmen thrown away in viſionary ſchemes and ill-concerted expeditions.

I ſhall not follow you in your remarks upon the ſtate of Ireland. Time will ſhew whether you

you or the Miniſter are right in your prognoſtics. But, if you extend your approbation of Mr. Fox to the fatal ſyſtem, that the lives and property of our Proteſtant brethren in that country are to be ſubjected to Roman Catholic juriſdiction, on that ſubject I ſhall be ready to meet you; and I am confident I can prove, that the conduct of his Majeſty, in this inſtance, has been the ſalvation of Ireland, and, perhaps, of Great Britain herſelf.

You have made light of our late colonial acquiſitions. Conqueſts without bloodſhed, ſeem but little adapted to your taſte. If, however, as you ſtated, France and Holland are rich enough to "throw away" ſuch poſſeſſions; England, I am glad to find, is not rich enough, or fooliſh enough, to reject them. The very paper which contains your extravagant aſſertion on this ſubject, a paper not uſually very friendly to the cauſe of Miniſters, now lies before me. It conveys, at once, the evil and the antidote; for it ſpeaks of "the great number of veſſels, both here and in the out-ports, already taken up for theſe colonies;" and adds, that "at leaſt 200 ſail of ſhipping will be required to bring home the produce on hand," &c. I have heard of ſuch an expreſſion as "periſh our commerce:" but I confeſs I did not feel any very high reſpect for the wiſdom of the perſon by whom it was employed; and I am, therefore, enough of a plain Engliſhman to rejoice in ſuch information as I have now quoted.

The length to which this letter has already extended, admoniſhes me that it is already time to take my leave of you, for the preſent. Like the ſpectre, however, which is ſaid to have intruded on the lucubrations of a brother Philoſopher in former

former times, I muſt couple my adieu, with the promiſe "thou ſhalt ſee me again at Philippi—aye, at Philippi." On the preſent occaſion I have confined myſelf to the defence of Miniſters; at a future opportunity, I may, poſſibly, be called upon to examine the character and conduct of their opponents. In the mean time, I remain, Sir,

Your's, &c.

London, Nov. 25. VALERIUS.

LETTER

LETTER XIII.

TO THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

COUNTRYMEN AND FRIENDS,

THAT I have not been an unconcerned ſpectator of the preſent arduous conteſt, the papers which have already borne this ſignature will ſufficiently teſtify; and to thoſe papers I might confidently appeal for the truth of the aſſertion, that my humble exertions have had but one object in view, and that object is the ſafety and proſperity of our country. The favourable reception which I am told theſe papers have experienced from you, I muſt cite as an additional evidence of what I aſſert; ſince I cannot pay you ſo ill a compliment, as to ſuppoſe, that you would give your attention to a writer whoſe purpoſe you were aware was to deceive or miſlead you. But to put out of the queſtion every perſonal argument, and even that honeſty of intention which I cannot but feel, allow me to ſay, I wiſh to addreſs your *reaſon*, and not your prejudices; every argument I advance I would have carefully conſidered, ſince that conviction only can be laſting which is founded in truth.

It is not a matter of ſurpriſe that the advocates of party ſhould endeavour to perſuade you to withhold your confidence from his Majeſty's preſent Government. That one writer in the public papers ſhould wiſh to ſee the Miniſter ſupplanted by Mr. WINDHAM, and another by Mr. FOX, is no more extraordinary, than that thoſe Gentlemen themſelves ſhould devoutly wiſh for ſuch a conſum-

ſummation. Nay, I will admit, there may even exiſt honeſt, independent, and diſintereſted men, who may fancy that the country can only be ſafe in the hands of that leader whoſe talents or whoſe opinions they have been accuſtomed to admire. I cannot, however, think ſo meanly of this great, this enlightened nation, as to ſuppoſe the talents of *any individual* abſolutely neceſſary to its ſalvation. There is no country upon earth more fertile in talents than our own; and if even the preſent Servants of the Crown were diſmiſſed, I will venture to aſſert, that we could ſtill find Miniſters fully adequate to its preſervation, without having recourſe to the leaders either of the New or the Old Oppoſition. But there are many, and to a plain man like myſelf, cogent reaſons why the preſent Miniſters ſhould not be diſmiſſed, and why they ſhould, on the contrary, have our cordial ſupport, and particularly at a criſis like the preſent.

The firſt reaſon I ſhall urge is, becauſe they are his MAJESTY's choice. No man verſed in our Conſtitution, will deny that it is the undoubted prerogative of the KING to appoint his own ſervants; and unleſs they have proved themſelves diſhoneſt, unconſtitutional, or inadequate to the charge, it is a reſpect which we owe to one of the beſt and moſt upright of SOVEREIGNS, who cannot be accuſed of acting, on any occaſion, from humour or caprice, to acquieſce in that appointment. But even if the caſe were otherwiſe, and if there were any man, or any body of men, who had a right to object to his MAJESTY's choice in this inſtance, he muſt have very lightly conſidered political affairs, who would haſtily be deſirous of *a change*. It is always for the advantage of the nation,

tion, (and it is particularly ſo at the preſent period) that the KING and his Miniſters ſhould be in perfect accord with each other. When a Miniſtry is forced upon a Sovereign, whatever may be their talents, he cannot repoſe in them the ſame entire and implicit confidence, as where his choice is free; and the public buſineſs muſt be very ill-conducted where there is not the moſt perfect harmony and confidence between the ſupreme director and the inferior agents of the Executive Government. In ſuch a criſis as the preſent, it is more neceſſary than ever, that nothing like reſerve or diſtruſt ſhould exiſt on the part of his MAJESTY towards the ſervants of the Crown. A good ſubject would even wiſh to conſult his MAJESTY'S perſonal feelings on *ſuch an occaſion*, and would not bear to add a ſingle cauſe of regret or uneaſineſs to the cares with which his MAJESTY muſt be at this moment encompaſſed.

But, in the ſecond place, the preſent Miniſters ought not to be diſmiſſed, becauſe they have done nothing worthy of diſmiſſal: on the contrary, they have, I will venture to ſay, done as much as human wiſdom and foreſight could effect, for the ſecurity and welfare of the nation. I defy the moſt determined Oppoſitioniſt, new or old, to bring home to them a ſingle charge of omiſſion or commiſſion. This is a ſubject of commendation which every man, however private his ſituation in life, can at once apply. When I ſit at my own fire-ſide, with my children, my family, and my friends around me, I cannot help reflecting, that to the mercy of the Divine Providence, to the ſpirit of my country, and the vigour and prudence of the Miniſters, I am indebted for theſe bleſſings. I know

know not what *other* men in their ſituation might have done, but I know what *they* have effected. The one is a matter of doubt and conjecture; the other is a certainty, and a certainty of a very conſolatory nature. I know that ſix months ſince, many intelligent and judicious perſons would have thought the country undone could a French army of forty thouſand men have made good a landing, and that *now* we ſhould feel but little alarm if three times that force were upon our ſhores. I know, alſo, that the chances of their being able to land were then ten to one what they are at preſent. But, indeed, this matter is ſo obvious, that it is become a ſentiment rather than an opinion. There is not a man in England who does not *now* believe the country in a ſtate of perfect ſecurity;—and have we no obligation to the Miniſters under whom this has been effected? Was no capacity or talent evinced in making theſe arrangements; or no judgment in adopting the moſt effectual meaſures among the multitudes that might have been ſuggeſted? A *fact* will always ſpeak for itſelf, and will defy the logic even of Mr. WINDHAM. The fact is, the country was ſuppoſed to be, and I am of opinion *was really in danger*; it is acknowledged to be no longer in danger; and I feel that thoſe who have taken us out of the one ſituation, and placed us in the other, are deſerving of our confidence and ſupport.

There are ſome among us, I am aware, who imagine that no perſon is qualified to be a Firſt Miniſter of this country, who is not a *fine orator*. What the talents of the preſent Miniſters may be in this reſpect I know not, nor indeed do I care. I judge of Stateſmen by their meaſures, and not by

by their loquacity. I know of an old and homely proverb to this effect, but I will not quote it. Yet let it not be supposed that I am an enemy to eloquence. On the contrary, I admire it. Oratory is a *fine art*; so is poetry, so is music: but let it be remembered, that the *sole end* of each is *entertainment*. I will cheerfully, therefore, subscribe to the doctrine, that it is very lawful to have *fine orators to entertain us*; but I will not sacrifice any thing substantial to the mere circumstance of having my ears tickled with fascinating sounds. As soon would I think of entrusting a man at this critical period, with the command of the British Army, merely because he had written a sublime and beautiful poem; or of making another Lord High Admiral, because he enchanted me with his musical powers; as advise, that a person should be entrusted with our lives and fortunes as Minister, merely because I was delighted with his eloquence.

I have read a little history, and I know what orators have done. The Athenians had orators for their rulers; but PHILIP had statesmen and warriors for his Ministers. It is a fact upon record, that PHILIP encouraged the Athenian orators, because he knew they would facilitate his designs; and that they would waste that time in debating which ought to be devoted to action. DEMOSTHENES, the greatest of them all, was a blunderer in council, and a coward in the field. CICERO himself (and where shall be found a CICERO?) was a very indifferent, wavering, timid, inconsistent statesman; and fell at last the dupe of a man who never pretended to eloquence. On the other hand, I never heard that RICHELIEU, or SULLY, or DE WITT, or MARLBOROUGH, were orators;

orators: the firſt, indeed, had a ſtrange fancy to be thought a poet; but nobody would ever have made him a Miniſter of State for his poetry. In our own country, I never have ſeen any beneficial effects reſulting from this entertaining art; but I have often ſeen it impede and embarraſs the buſineſs of Government. I have ſeen thirteen colonies *harangued away* by certain *fine Orators* in both Houſes; and, if I am not miſtaken, ſome of thoſe very Orators now conſtitute the *Executive Directory* of the New Oppoſition.

So much for Orators; and may they, as well as their auditors, hereafter ſlumber in peace! But, in the *third* place, I think the preſent Miniſters ought to be ſupported, becauſe their temper and habits are correſpondent with the temper and habits of the people whom they are appointed to govern. It is an old maxim, and becauſe it is vulgar, it does not follow that it muſt be falſe, "that Engliſhmen may be led, but not driven." Nothing can be ſo little in harmony with the ſpirit and character of this nation, as a haughty, imperious, violent, or irraſcible Adminiſtration.—However pure their intentions, their meaſures are invariably aſcribed to a predilection for arbitrary power, and that is what Engliſhmen will not endure. One violent and haſty expreſſion from that truly great man, Sir Robert Walpole, loſt him all his popularity; and, to quote an inſtance ſtill more in point, though I think highly of Mr. Windham in ſome reſpects, yet, after what he has ſaid of the Volunteers, can any man in his ſenſes believe that they would bear him as a Miniſter? I would almoſt lay it down as a maxim, that it would be ſafer ſometimes to err with the people (provided the error were not a ra-

dical and fatal error), than to be right in direct hostility to all their prejudices and feelings. This was strongly experienced with respect to the famous Jew Bill; and the unfortunate JAMES, perhaps, lost his Crown more from counteracting the rivetted sentiments and ancient opinions of the British nation, than from what he did that was actually bad and unconstitutional. I would not be understood to say, that some parts of the conduct of this Monarch were not actually illegal and wicked; but I am much mistaken, if these were what most immediately contributed to his downfall. Now the present Ministers have had the *good fortune* (let us use this word for the present to avoid dispute) *to conciliate the affections of the people.* The people wished for peace, and they gave it to them; again, when the country was insulted and menaced, the insult was resented by the Ministers, and they were gloriously seconded by the spirit of the people. Even strong measures have been enforced by them in a gentle and persuasive tone; and, to disclose a secret, which must one day come out, essential as these measures were to our national safety, had it not been for the *manner* in which they were introduced to the public, they would never have been borne. I may be mistaken, but yet I can conceive an Administration (and one not destitute of talents) under which such an immense naval force as four hundred and sixty-nine ships of war, would not have been so expeditiously manned and equipped without murmur or tumult; a body of twenty-five thousand Sea Fencibles enlisted to serve their country gratis; and a Volunteer force of four hundred thousand men added to our regular standing army. Granting that this was effected chiefly by address;

addreſs; ſtill to have the addreſs to effect ſuch things is no contemptible talent; and a Miniſtry who could do all this, and keep the people in good humour, is not to be deſpiſed.

Laſtly, I aſſert, that the preſent Adminiſtration deſerve our ſupport for their *truly conſtitutional conduct* upon every occaſion. It is no mean conſolation to feel aſſured, that our laws and conſtitution are in ſuch hands as will not violate or abuſe them.—May I never ſee a Miniſter, who will plead for "a vigour beyond the law." He may be ſuited to the meridian of France or Germany, but he never will do for Great Britain. The credit of Mr. Fox was utterly deſtroyed by his attempting to ſport with "Chartered Rights," though all agreed that ſome meaſure was neceſſary for the regulation of India; and many thought his plan not exceptionable. In this view I give great credit both to the Britiſh and the Iriſh Government, for their conſtitutional proceedings with reſpect to the criminals engaged in the late rebellion. It muſt have been much more ſatisfactory to the country, perhaps more ſatisfactory even to the ſufferers themſelves, that their puniſhment ſhould be the reſult of a legal trial before a Jury of their countrymen, than of the ſentence of a Court-Martial.

Theſe are a few of the reaſons, my countrymen, why I think we are all of us intereſted in the ſupport of his MAJESTY's preſent Government, and why we ſhould not be miſled by the ſenſeleſs and *intereſted* clamours of party. If I had ever heard *one* ſound argument againſt the Adminiſtration, I ſolemnly proteſt I would not have paſſed it by unnoticed. But I have ſeen or heard nothing as yet

on this ſubject but unmeaning epithets, vulgar and groundleſs abuſe and declamation, ſuch as I am perſuaded your good ſenſe, ſo far from encouraging, will ſcarcely endure.

London, Dec. 26. VALERIUS.

LET-

LETTER XIV.

To the VOLUNTEER ARMY of ENGLAND.

GENTLEMEN, *London, Jan.* 20.

IT was my determination, ſome weeks ago, to have withdrawn myſelf entirely from public notice, and to have ceaſed to trouble the readers of this Paper with my ſpeculations on political ſubjects. When I commenced this ſeries of letters, the times were very different; ſuch as, in my opinion, called for the exertions of every friend to his country, however humble might be the opinion he entertained of his own abilities. The glorious and patriotic ſpirit manifeſted by the whole Britiſh nation, and by you, Gentlemen, in particular, has materially altered the aſpect of the public affairs. I feel that I am no longer wanted; and I am now induced only to depart, in a ſingle inſtance, from the reſolution I had formed, by the indignation which I cannot but feel at the unwarranted charges ſo invidiouſly brought forward againſt a body of men, to whom every loyal ſubject of his MAJESTY muſt acknowledge himſelf perſonally indebted.

Gentlemen, I have no heſitation in publicly declaring that you have been baſely and ſcandalouſly treated. That deſperate faction who would ſell their country, trample on their King; who would invite the enemy to our ſhores; and (from my heart I believe,) would, to promote their ſelfiſh ends, endeavour to give him poſſeſſion of the kingdom; that faction, Gentlemen, have done their utmoſt to vili-

fy and defame your laudable, your honeſt, your diſintereſted exertions for the public ſecurity. And why? Why are they thus rancorouſly and malignantly bent upon creating diſſatisfaction among you? Why? But becauſe they perceive, that, under the Divine Providence, you have been inſtrumental in ſaving the nation, and thus defeating their own perfidious, I had almoſt ſaid traiterous, deſigns.

I ſhould be ſorry, however, to ſee you, from this circumſtance, in any degree diſcouraged. Oppoſition from the ill-diſpoſed is as much to be expected as commendation from the good. If this party defame you, it is only what they have done by every other branch of the public ſervice, which, in this awful criſis, has contributed to the ſafety and the proſperity of the State. They have done it by the Admiralty; they have done it by the whole of his MAJESTY's Miniſters, while they have been labouring with the ſame zeal by which you are prompted, for the general good, and employing the moſt efficacious means for defeating the projects of an inveterate enemy.

The objections which have been brought againſt you, Gentlemen, both in Parliament and out, may be reduced to five. 1ſt. The exemptions from the militia ballot, to which you have become entitled from the ſervices you now perform. 2d. The inſtitution of committees for the regulation of your affairs. 3d. The election of officers by the reſpective corps. 4th. The incapacity of enforcing attendance upon drills. And, laſtly, The want of order and military obedience. All theſe I ſhall endeavour briefly to examine. In treating of them, I ſhall uſe the *freedom* of a real *friend*; and any

ſtrictures

ſtrictures which I may find it neceſſary to admit upon your conſtitution or your conduct, will, I fear not, be received with that candour, which purity of intention, and ſincere and tried regard, have a right to challenge.

In addreſſing you, Gentlemen, I conſider myſelf as addreſſing men actuated by the beſt motives, by the ſoundeſt principles; as men who have made great ſacrifices to a pure and diſintereſted love of your country; as men who will ſtand recorded in hiſtory as actuated by an heroiſm unſullied by a crime, untarniſhed by any thing baſe and unworthy; as men, in fine, whoſe example (in ſpite of the malignity of a wretched faction) will form the boaſt of your poſterity; as men, therefore, who will bear to hear the truth, and be diſpoſed to profit even from the cenſures of their enemies.

Your adverſaries and ours, the adverſaries of their King and country, have endeavoured to aſſail you by an inſinuation, which could only originate in the baſeneſs of their own minds (judging of you by themſelves,) "that you engaged in this ſervice only to ſcreen yourſelves from a ſeverer duty, that of being called upon to ſerve your country in the militia." This calumny has been anſwered, and nobly and generouſly anſwered, by the Miniſter himſelf. For my own part, I think I can affirm, as to the majority of you, that the firſt idea of exemption which entered your minds, was, when you heard it from the mouths of your defamers. But, with reſpect to the exemptions, I muſt ſay, they are only your *due*, your *right*, your *inheritance*. Your country would have treated you moſt ungenerouſly had it not made this conceſſion to your merits. A man cannot ſerve his

country at once in both capacities; he cannot be at once a volunteer and a militia-man. If, therefore, a volunteer force be neceſſary or conducive to the ſafety of the nation, let the ſervices be diſtinct; let the lazy, the ſelfiſh, the factious, thoſe who can make no ſacrifice but upon compulſion, let them contribute to a compulſory ſervice. I care not how hard it preſſes upon them. The law exempts from the militia ballot, the aged, the infirm, and thoſe who have infant families to maintain. Let thoſe who have none of theſe excuſes to plead, and who had neither ſpirit nor patriotiſm to enrol themſelves, when their country called upon them by every motive for its defence; let them furniſh the ſtipulated quota which the law requires. Here, indeed, Gentlemen, lies the ſecret of one motive by which a certain Party is induced to abuſe you. They find that *you* are exempted, and *themſelves* are not; they envy you for poſſeſſing advantages which they have not merited; and, while you have voluntarily embraced hazards and inconveniencies, the very chance of which they would wiſh to decline, they exclaim, that they are hardly treated, becauſe the number is reduced from which the ſelection for the militia is to be made.

On the ſecond topic your enemies would have more right to enlarge, could the charge be ſubſtantiated in the manner they wiſh. Nothing, certainly, could be more ridiculous than to controul military arrangements by the vote of a committee, many of whom may, perhaps, not be even in the ranks. But while Committees confine themſelves altogether to the regulation of pecuniary matters, and to the furniſhing of adequate ſupplies for the expences of the corps, they are not only harmleſs but uſeful.

uſeful. I would, however, wiſh and adviſe, that as the inſtitution of Volunteer Corps is an effort the moſt honourable to the country that ever has been made, nothing like a ſtigma, or reflection, ſhould be ſuffered to reſt upon it. In ſuch an inſtitution I would even avoid all appearance of evil. I would therefore recommend, that not only the Committees ſhould be placed under the reſtrictions I have intimated as to their functions, but that theſe functions ſhould be even indicated by the *name*, and that the Committees ſhould hereafter be diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Committees* of *Supply*, or *Committees* of *Finance*, or *Treaſurer's Committees*, or any other denomination which would remove the ſuſpicion of ſuch Committees interfering in matters, where it is the general opinion they ſhould not interfere. I do not aſſert, that it is poſſible to reduce the Volunteer Army of England to the ſtandard of a regular army, nor perhaps is it neceſſary; but certainly the more you can be aſſimilated to a regular army, the greater perfection you will attain; the greater will be your *honour*, your *utility*, your perſonal *ſafety*; for the perſonal ſafety of every *individual* in a corps, is involved in the perfection of diſcipline which the corps, as a body, may have attained.

Unfortunately for human nature, no art has been more ſtudied than the art of war; and, as men of tranſcendent talents have given their whole attention to it, no art has been brought to higher perfection. That perfection you ſee in the great regular armies of Europe. It is there effected certainly by a ſyſtem of force and coercion; but I cannot be of opinion that force and coercion will do more on any occaſion than voluntary efforts,

in

in which the heart and the wiſhes of the party are engaged. What the individuals conſtituting a regular army do by force, you will do by your free will and conſent; and if you are actuated by a proper ſpirit (ſuch as I think I perceive in the Volunteers in general), there is no reaſon why you may not attain a degree of excellence very little ſhort of that poſſeſſed by the moſt regular army in Europe.

The third, the election of your officers, is a very delicate topic; I moſt ſincerely wiſh any plan could be deviſed for preventing at once the evils of popular elections, and conciliating the minds of the reſpective corps. Speaking with the utmoſt candour and impartiality, I ſee almoſt inſuperable objections to the ſyſtem of popular election. In great ſtates, and where the liberties of men are to be preſerved, it is neceſſary to have recourſe to this ſyſtem, and no Government can be free which is not a repreſentative Government. But the ſyſtem of popular election ſhould never be reſorted to, where it can with ſafety be avoided. It gives a great ſcope to intrigue; and the moſt diſhoneſt man, who will ſacrifice moſt to the humour of the electors, is generally the favourite and ſucceſsful candidate. In caſes where the matter is conteſted, the *whole of the loſing party* are naturally diſguſted, and theſe diſguſts too often end in irreconcileable feuds and quarrels. I much fear that no army, not even a Volunteer army, could long exiſt with the ſyſtem of popular elections. There are certainly many objections to the ſyſtem of *regular ſucceſſion by ſeniority*; yet, in this caſe, it would, perhaps, be the ſafeſt to which to recur. In the original appointment of Officers, I take it for granted, that the moſt eligible perſons were choſen to the chief ranks,

ranks, the next beſt to the ſecond, and ſo in ſucceſſion. If, therefore, on a vacancy occurring, a regular promotion were to take place, from the vacant office down to the ranks, I conceive the evils of diſcontent and diſſatisfaction, would be completely obviated; or if it be found, that by law the appointment be veſted in the Lord Lieutenant, on the recommendation of the Colonel, or other officers, I hope, for the ſatisfaction and peace of the corps, ſome ſuch order, as that I now recommend, will be adopted: and that on every occaſion the promotion will be made within the corps.

Fourthly, If you are to be made ſoldiers, a regular mode of inſtruction muſt be purſued, and an aſſiduous attendance upon drill is abſolutely neceſſary. You have, in general, inſtituted fines for the enforcement of attendance. I have ſeen ſomething of the management of Volunteer Corps, and in all the inſtances which I have obſerved, I have found reaſon to applaud the judgment and liberality of the Officers, both in enforcing the fines where there was no excuſe, and in diſpenſing with them on proper occaſions. The cauſe is ſo truly honourable, that I confeſs I ſhould wiſh to ſee it characterized by *liberality* in every inſtance, and as little diſgraced as poſſible by paſſion or peviſhneſs on either ſide. Conſidering the importance of the ſervice, I ſhould hope no volunteer ſoldier would willingly omit the opportunities which are afforded him for inſtruction; and the more ſo, as this omiſſion muſt tend to render him inferior in the neceſſary qualifications to his brother ſoldiers, and muſt therefore leſſen and degrade him in their eyes, and in the eyes of others. I would rather ſee you made good ſoldiers by emulation than by force. On the other hand, I think that legitimate excuſes

excuſes ought to be liberally admitted, ſince it was never meant that the duties of a Volunteer ſhould abſorb all others, even thoſe which a man owes to a family, for whoſe ſubſiſtence he is bound to provide.

From the enforcement of the fines, another unfortunate queſtion has ariſen, "the right of reſignation." As this is a ſubject of legal diſcuſſion, it would be indelicate in any man not immediately called on, and eſpecially if not of the legal profeſſion, to anticipate its deciſion. As to the reſult, I confeſs I am very eaſy:—ſhould the determination, contrary to the ſpirit of the General Defence Act, admit of the reſignation of enrolled and atteſted Volunteers, I know *you will not reſign*. There is a tribunal higher than thoſe of Weſtminſter-Hall, the COURT of HONOUR. The infamous incendiary (the tool of the deſpicable faction to which I have alluded) has endeavoured to ſtigmatize you as *cowards*. I know you will not give him any advantage over you; I know you will feel a pride in refuting his infamous calumnies; and ſhould the Volunteer ſyſtem undergo a legiſlative reviſion, I truſt a regulation will be adopted limiting the term of your ſervice, and preſcribing the neceſſary notice to be given of an intention to reſign.

The laſt charge which is brought againſt you is a heavy charge indeed; were it not that your fellow ſubjects throughout the kingdom muſt be convinced that it is *moſt unjuſt*. That inſubordination has exiſted to any extent in the Volunteer Corps, I do not believe. It is, indeed, the *pride* of our country that it has not: ſhew me the inſtance of an army of *four hundred thouſand men*, exiſting in any country,

try, or in any circumſtances, for eight months, without the controul of martial law, without the appearance of a mutiny! A ſtory has been produced in the common weekly vehicle of libels, and I am ſorry to have ſeen it copied into more reſpectable ſources of public intelligence. You will perceive I allude to a tranſaction which is ſaid to have taken place at Cheſter. I have no heſitation in pronouncing it, in direct terms, an *infamous falſehood*, at leaſt, in the manner in which it is ſtated; and my confidence in this aſſertion is founded ſolely on the character of the paper in which it firſt appeared. So notoriouſly unprincipled indeed is this publication, that its *affirmation* upon any ſubject amounts to exactly the ſame as the moſt ſatisfactory *negative evidence* that can be produced in a Court of Juſtice. Till, therefore, I ſee the tale corroborated by ſome better evidence, I muſt, reaſoning on a principle which never yet has failed me, believe it *falſe*.*

I muſt hope, however, that this inſtance of the promptneſs of your adverſaries to calumny and detraction, will ſuffice to put you effectually on your guard. When you find any ill-diſpoſed perſons endeavouring to provoke ſtriſe and diſſatisfaction among you, regard them as the emiſſaries of that wicked faction, who, by degrading you, would deprive your country of its defence, and would betray both the nation and the King to the common enemy. After ſuch a warning, I moſt earneſtly hope I ſhall never ſee any indication of a diſorderly, much leſs of a mutinous ſpirit, among the Volunteer defenders of their country; and with

* Since this Letter was received, our Correſpondent's opinion has been confirmed by authentic teſtimony, and even the libeller has been obliged to retract. EDITOR.

with this wiſh, as ſincerely as fervently expreſſed, I bid you affectionately farewell.

VALERIUS.

P. S. Though foreign to the general purpoſe of this letter, permit me to recommend a matter to your ſerious conſideration, as I cannot but think it of great national importance. As conſiderable numbers of yon are practiſed in firing at a target, permit me to recommend, in the metropolis eſpecially, the forming *one* or *two companies* in each regiment, compoſed of the very *beſt markſmen*, who may occaſionally act as *Tirailleurs* or *Rifle-men.* The drill dreſs of the London regiments, with the addition of a green feather, or no feather at all, will conſtitute a very good uniform for this purpoſe; and the common muſket will anſwer every end, unleſs you ſhould find it convenient to exchange the pieces of theſe companies with Government, for others ſomewhat lighter. The rifle bore is of no conſequence. It is unneceſſary to tell you, that the Americans owed all their principal ſucceſſes to their rifle companies; and the moſt ſplendid of the French victories were gained chiefly by the activity of their Tirailleurs.

THE END.

349434 HE C7294kx

Author [Combe, William]

Title The letters of Valerius, on the state of parties, the war, etc.

DATE. NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto Library

DO NOT REMOVE THE CARD FROM THIS POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED